of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador, J. Rivers Childs, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

To be consuls of the United States of America:

Archie W. Childs
Ralph A. Borchestine

To be consuls of the United States of America:

Hendrik van Oss
Eimer Newton
Joseph A. Armenta
William A. Withus
Semour J. Nadler

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles K. Mofly
Alfonso Rodriguez

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis J. Meehan

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Argyle R. Mackey, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chauncey F. Tramutolo to be United States attorney for the northern district of California.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James M. Roche to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

John Wesley Thompson Fallner IV, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi. (Now serving under an appointment which expired April 10, 1951.)

Robert E. Boen to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA
Edwin H. McNutt, Hanceville.

GEORGIA
Edward H. Osborne, Avondale Estates.

ILLINOIS
Joseph Vern Dunn, Montpelier.

JERSEY
C. Hardie, Dyer, Fairfax.

FRANKLIN
Francis W. Griggs, Fairbury.

OCTOBER
Oliver W. Aor, Jr., Griggsville.

NELLE M. Antle, Hanna City.

PEARL L. Butler, Kankakee.

WILLIAM G. Cabbage, Joy.

CARROLL K. Heitzman, Litchfield.

JOY A. Mitchell, Noble.

CHARLES C. Foul, Rossville.

JERRY H. Millstrom, Waltonville.

INDIANA
Richard L. Teeters, Martinsville.

Oklahoma
W. Marion Estes, Oklahoma City.

Ralph H. Adams, Newport.

Gershon A. Adams, North Salem.

KENTUCKY
Richie Linden, New York.

Mildred J. Golden, Bethany.

LAUTrANA
Jack W. Lemons, Abita Springs.

Ruth Maloff, Braithwaite.

Frederick J. Dugas, Paucourtville.

John I. Roberts, Venice.

MICHIGAN
John O. Steel, Mount Airy.

Elwood F. Armstour, Upperco.

MINNESOTA
Albert E. Anderson, Montevideo.

MONTANA
William J. Brown, Dixon.

NEBRASKA
Grace G. Webb, Arcadia.

Laurence A. Cosman, Arnold.

James M. Casey, Johnson.

Leonard L. Grattopp, Shickley.

OHIO
Harry F. McLaughlin, Carrollton.

Warren D. Hoffmeyer, Cortland.

John Bennett Burford, Farmdale.

Charles R. Kline, Medway.

Howard R. Thompson, Fileton.

Donald F. Auker, Seville.

OKLAHOMA
Lorraine S. Fogarty, Guthrie.

Homer Schneider, Hitchcock.

Francis B. Bordenkircher, Jennings.

OREGON
Harry F. Way, Aumsville.

Velma F. Evans, Elmina.

Chester L. Langeat, Klamath Falls.

WEST VIRGINIA
James A. Sarnes, Climbay.

Bob Henderson, Sistertown.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 18 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

POSTMASTER
Paul A. Hughes, Granville, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Bras-kamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, the creator and source of life and light, we thank Thee for all the beautiful and marvelous revelations and changes which we are witnessing in the world of nature during this glorious spring season.

We pray that these changes may be inner as well as outer experiences, inspiring us to have our lives rooted and grounded in Thy divine life in order that we may grow in moral and spiritual stature, in beauty and strength of character, and in obedience to Thy divine laws.

May the mysteries and splendors of nature, upon which we are looking with wonder and amazement, challenge and stir us with a rebirth of spiritual desires and a renewed spirit of fidelity and devotion to life's loftiest aspirations and noblest principles.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whom poets and prophets have called the Lily of the Valley, the Rose of Sharon, the Bright and Morning Star, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had returned pursuant to House Resolution 195, the bill H. R. 3587, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled “An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes”; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Russell, Mr. Byrd, Mr. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Barkley to confer on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnson of South Carolina and Mr. Lang to be members of the Joint committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled “An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government,” for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–18.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow during the opening and adjournment of the House the doors of the House will be open and the doors of the Speaker's left and right and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

No one will be allowed in the gallery who does not have a ticket.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for tomorrow, and to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

W. STUART SYMINGTON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3709, with Mr. Parce in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are any amendments to the paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HUSBAND OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Employment Service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force; and not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 16 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S., C. 550); $4,635,500, of which $743,500 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Service men's Readjustment Act of 1944 (55 Stat. 737), recommendations of the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from $10,000,000 to $743,500. I am in receipt of a letter from the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the United States Veterans of World War II, which I would like to read at this time, relative to this drastic cut.

The letter is as follows:

To the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Member of Congress:

We, the undersigned, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II, wish to strongly protest the report of the Department of Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which recommends the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from $10,000,000 to $743,500.

The committee expressed its belief that one Federal veterans' representative and a clerk-stenographer will be sufficient for the House, together with a small headquarters staff, would be adequate. This action amounts to a cut of over 93 percent, and in money an amount of $2,895,500. This constitutes a staggering and crippling blow to an already small but hard-working and sincere Government service agency.

The Veterans' Employment Service is mandated by the people of this Nation and the Congress, under provision of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to cooperate and aid the United States Employment Service and State employment services to the veterans shall receive the maximum of job counseling and job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The report of the committee shows that the budget estimates on the Veterans' Employment Service of the Labor Department was $277,000,000, and the amount allowed was $277,000,000. Therefore, it is rather difficult to understand the communication which the gentleman has received.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the gentleman from New York that on the basis of the information I have the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service was $1,583,000, and it has been reduced to $743,500.

If the gentleman will allow me to continue with this letter, I will put all the facts on the record.

The letter reads further as follows:

To reduce this splendid, compact, well-organized force of 178 professional field representatives, together with 1,164 professional staff members located in Washington, a shell of some 38 field representatives and a correspondingly smaller number of clerical workers would simply render the Veterans' Employment Service incapable of performing the responsibilities and duties mandated to them by law.

Let us point out that there still remains a sizable future task to be accomplished in terms of employment of veterans currently being trained under programs sponsored by the Government. As of February 28, 1951, the Veterans' Administration reported 4,644 veterans in educational and training programs under provisions of Public Law 446. On the same date the Veterans' Employment Service will probably be faced with a situation which will not differ basically from that of 1945 and 1946. Thousands of servicemen will be discharged from service with combat disabilities and additional thousands with injuries resulting from other accidents. It will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service to facilitate their return to civil life by finding them suitable employment.

Notwithstanding statistics which indicate that there are still more than 1,000,000 veterans of both World Wars and 400,000,000 acres of idle lands, and the labor market is tightening, the fact remains that there are many combative veterans with education and training.

Many areas still have relatively high unemployment. Opportunity to materially reduce unemployment in these areas appears to be available to the veterans and their families through the Veterans Employment Service. The ability and desire of the veterans to assist a significant portion of their number with the financing of the services of the Veterans Employment Service and the Federal Public Work Corps in the employment of veterans of World War II is a challenge to which the veterans respond wholeheartedly. The public organizations see it that is the Veterans'
Employment Service can make a most significant contribution in using its special facilities to gain for the veteran advancement in the jobs which will make full use of the skills he has acquired and the experience he has undergone. We believe that it is absolutely essential that their efforts and continuing positive accomplishments be maintained.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II at their respective 1950 conventions and conventions mandated full support to the maintenance of the Employment Service and its operation of service to veterans in the field of employment. We, therefore, the undersigned, respectfully request that action be taken which will result in the restoration of twenty per cent as requested by the President in his budget for the fiscal year 1922-1923.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment on page 16, line 3, may be considered at this time, for I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will make a point of order against it also on the same grounds. I make this request in order that my remarks may be directed to both amendments at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That, for the purposes of this appropriation, (1) the local contribution rate computed for any local educational agency under section 3 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average local contribution rate during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and (2) the current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education under section 4 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. SCHWAEBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHWAEBE. I wanted to know if the gentleman's remarks applied to both amendments.

Mr. NORRELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHWAEBE. I was not only one. Would the last amendment offered by the gentleman be legislation on an appropriation bill or merely a limiting amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. I am advised by the House Parliamentarian that it is legislation, and I believe that is correct. What I say has to do with both amendments. The construction amendment, however, deals with the matter of constructing these school buildings in defense areas. It is estimated that the eventual cost may run to something like $800,000,000. If my amendment should be adopted it would reduce the Federal contribution in all the schools to a more conservative basis. The one on maintenance is this: It has developed that the Government must give to certain areas where they do not need much, if any, additional aid to schools. It is an enormous and unnecessary expenditure, but it must be made because there is no discretionary authority whatsoever in the Government officials who are enforcing the law. It has developed in other cases where a larger amount is needed. In certain areas they cannot under existing law get the amount they actually would need.

So my amendment, if adopted, would permit a variation or a scope of not less than 80 or more than 120 percent and would not cost the Government any more money. I admit both amendments are subject to the points of order made, but I move an amendment in order to get the matter in the record. I am going to introduce a bill on the subject and I trust that the legislative and executive committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that both amendments are subject to the points of order.

Mr. SCHWAEBE. Mr. Chairman, has there been an amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHWAEBE. I speak to the gentleman's amendment, to which I refer the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. SCHWAEBE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask an amendment on page 16, line 3, may be considered at this time, for I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will make a point of order against it also on the same grounds. I make this request in order that my remarks may be directed to both amendments at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That, for the purposes of this appropriation, (1) the local contribution rate computed for any local educational agency under section 3 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average local contribution rate during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and (2) the current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education under section 4 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."
Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman talking about Public Law 815, the school construction bill, or some situation which the Government does not have anything to do with at all?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am talking about the whole construction program on the home front. As the gentleman knows, for the past year there has been great concern on the part of the school officials and various leaders in separate communities and in every one of these construction programs. If you will recall, there have been instances in the case of every Member where he has been requested to advertise for some other Government official so that we could get some kind of priority of construction material in various civic endeavors back home. It seems to me that while we are in the face of a program that we ought to make allowances for the construction of schools and various community buildings so that as these defense programs grow, as workers are moved into one section or another, we will be able to continue with our community system. We do not want it to get the way it is behind the iron curtain where the whole communities are uprooted and deprived of the church and the school influence and other beneficial institution that we, as Americans, have accustomed to.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOGARTY. The need for a chapel for the hospital has been mentioned in annual reports for a number of years, but partly because the growth of the institution made such pressures for additional buildings the proposal to build a new chapel has not survived the review by the Bureau of the Budget. The request, therefore, has never officially been made to the Congress, and was not submitted this year in the budget estimates.

This hospital has about 8,500 patients. We can therefore realize what an important problem this is.

Furthermore, we all recognize the importance of religion and faith in our individual lives, as well as the need for some particular application to those in hospitals and probably extra emphasis should be laid upon those in mental institutions.

My purpose in rising to address the Committee of the Whole at this time is to have something in the Record to show that there is an interest in the near future in having such a chapel authorized and money provided for its construction.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee and the other Members of the subcommittee, as well as the members of the full Committee on Appropriations, if and when a budget estimate comes up, will give this matter their deep consideration, and I sincerely trust that when a budget estimate does come up in the future it will be favorably acted upon. Knowing the views and the sentiments of my friend the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fogarty), I am sure that he will go along with that viewpoint.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the 5 or 6 years that I have been on this committee, we have never had a budget estimate for this particular program, but I think I can assure the gentleman, in agreement with the rest of my subcommittee, that if a budget estimate is submitted to this committee next year it will be given every consideration.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of priorities in the construction program on the civilian level has come before the attention of each and every Member of this House in the form of letters from home from the various school boards and interested officials in the various school-building programs. I have in mind a particular program in my district where the school need is great indeed, yet there is apparently no ability on the part of the school board and the officials in that particular community to obtain the materials that they need.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is that in the Triple Cities area?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; it is a little north of the Triple Cities. There are other parts in my district besides the Triple Cities.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman talking about Public Law 815, the school construction bill, or some situation which the Government does not have anything to do with at all?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am talking about the whole construction program on the home front. As the gentleman knows, for the past year there has been great concern on the part of the school officials and various leaders in separate communities and in every one of these construction programs. If you will recall, there have been instances in the case of every Member where he has been requested to advertise for some other Government official so that we could get some kind of priority of construction material in various civic endeavors back home. It seems to me that while we are in the face of a program that we ought to make allowances for the construction of schools and various community buildings so that as these defense programs grow, as workers are moved into one section or another, we will be able to continue with our community system. We do not want it to get the way it is behind the iron curtain where the whole communities are uprooted and deprived of the church and the school influence and other beneficial institution that we, as Americans, have accustomed to.

Mr. PERKINS. From the gentleman's statement, do the schools that he has in mind come within the purview of Public Law 815 or not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All I can say to the gentleman is that we have to look ahead all the time. We have to look into the future and see what the possibilities will be, because within the next 6 months or a year or the next 2 years there may be a possibility of widespread cracking down on the procurement of various materials.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman assume again the gentleman is well aware of the fact that Public Law 815 takes care of impacted construction in impacted areas caused by the loss of revenue by the various school districts by reason of military and other defense installations. May I ask the gentleman if that law is not broad enough to cover the specific instances about which he is talking?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In the next 6 months there may be a wholesale cracking down with Mr. Wilson and some of the other high officials on the civilian population. We want to know what it is going to entail.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 3, the bill states:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Some questions come to my mind concerning this language. It appears to me this language is rather restrictive and may interfere with some programs which have been put into operation. May I ask some member of the committee if this language will restrict any of the work which is being done in connection with the GI training in distributive occupations?

Mr. FOGARTY. This law has nothing specific to do with the GI training. This appropriation is for distributive education under the George-Barden Act, for commissary or for education under that act for the next fiscal year, insofar as Federal funds are concerned.

Mr. MARSHALL. No funds under the George-Barden Act are being used in connection with GI training?

Mr. FOGARTY. This program was established before the GI bill became law—several years before.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have received several wires from retail establishments in the city of St. Paul concerning the programs they have there of training people to work on display and retail advertising, and so forth. What has been done, as I understand, under the George-Barden fund? As I understand this language, is would knock out that particular type of training. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Federal contribution to these schools is concerned, the statement is correct. However, it does not, of course, in any way prohibit the States from carrying on that work with their own funds.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand, as the chairman must realize, that there are a number of schools that have set those programs into operation expecting the cooperation of what they have had in the past with Federal funds.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me it is unfortunate that this language has been written into this bill. Does the gentleman agree that that, as important as it is in our free-enterprise system as production? In my own State it is going to mean that about 20,000 people who are now getting training will not in the future be able to get it.

Mr. MARSHALL. The language struck me as being unfortunate in the respect that this program has not been in operation any great length of time.
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I think it was 1947 that the program was inaugurated.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I brought up yesterday a question similar to the gentleman's. I checked my notes last night. In my opinion, where this does tie in with the GI on-the-job training is that many mercantile establishments have courses set up in high schools and other public schools under the Barden Act to fulfill their obligations for training under the GI on-the-job training program. That was the reaction they gave me in trying to check up in response to letters such as the evidence submitted to your committee, when you were conducting hearings on this subject, indicated the amount is adequate to meet the problem when the Committee on Education and Labor reported the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; they did not so state it. They stated at the time we held the hearing 6 months ago that they had just submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for an additional $100,000,000 for this fiscal year, 1951, and I have since learned in the last 3 days the Bureau of the Budget has allowed $50,000,000 of that request. That request has been sent to the other body where they are now holding hearings on this very bill and on the supplemental bill.

Mr. DONDERO. And the indications are that that amount might be added to the $75,000,000 provided in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not want the gentleman to be misled. That is not the $75,000,000 that you have referred to, which is being appropriated for the next fiscal year. The $50,000,000 to which I refer is a deficiency appropriation for this fiscal year of 1951.

Mr. DONDERO. That is to finish the fiscal year?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding and absolute conviction that should this provision for $50,000,000 additional—or $75,000,000—$25,000,000 of which is for this year, plus the $50,000,000 supplemental which has been requested, be enacted into law, we will still be short some eighty or eighty-five million dollars of the amount necessary to cover already approved projects.

Mr. DONDERO. And, of course, we anticipate other demands arising out of the present emergency program as a further Federal impact on local communities.

Mr. NORRELL. You have a problem which my amendment attempted to correct. In one area of the United States you will have a district that does not need any aid at all. In an area like yours you may need more money than you are getting. The amendment which I offered would simply have given the Department of Education discretionary authority to have used a little variation there from a minimum of not less than 80 percent to a maximum of not more than 120 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a school district in my congressional district where the people have exhausted all possible legal means to provide adequate school facilities, but they cannot meet the needs. The funds is the only aid to which they can look to solve the educational problems. They even sent their high school students for their physical education to the Detroit House of Correction, a penal institution, because of lack of space.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman, under Public Law 815, is absolutely correct in his statement. The reason that the Office of Education has been more towards alleviating the situation that you have described, although Public Law 815 authorizes alleviation of those conditions, is because of lack of funds. It has been reported to the subcommittee that 97 school districts have made application for Federal assistance for school construction, under section 202 of this law. There are different types of aid, as I see it, in my judgment, which fit the situation which the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Norrell) has described; namely, sections 202, 203, and 204. If we had adequate funds to implement all of those sections to take care of the Paducah, Ky., situation, and the Savannah River school housing under section 203, it has been estimated it would cost approximately $380,000,000 to solve this problem amply. The authorization to take care of this situation, with the exception I have noted, we have on the books at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. Undoubtedly Paducah, Ky., and Livonia Township school district, now the city of Livonia, Wayne County, Mich., in my district are in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Don­dero) has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject that is very dear to my heart, because I spent about 5 months with the Bailey committee seeing this problem in its reality in the South and in the eastern part of our country. What the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Don­dero) says is positively true. If anything, the situation around Michigan is going to be worse in the next few years than it has been during the last 5 years, because you have a Federal influx in the area of the fringe of Detroit.

I do not know what the representatives of the Department of Education think in their report, but as I do in the Committee on Appropriations, but I do know that in my State of Minnesota there are about nine communities that are affected with a Federal impact.

When I made inquiry of the Department, after this appropriation last year, and all of these applications from all over the United States had been filed with the Department, it is my understanding that I got from the Department in the allocation of these funds as prescribed by the yardstick in this bill: It was a foregone conclusion that they had to meet nearly enough to satisfy the eligible or legitimate requests. So as those applications came in, the policy was to make payment on the basis of those recommended—those districts which were most seriously affected, which meant that in the long run there would probably be 200 districts which, by law, were entitled to reimbursement, either under maintenance and operation or construction, but they would have to wait.
Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WIER. Certainly.
Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman and his committee came to our part of Michigan and made a very thorough and very conscientious investigation. In some of the areas that you visited the population doubled in the 10-year period.
Mr. WIER. And it is increasing today. The HARRISON. Is increasing now.
Mr. WIER. So I say to this House as a friend of education, that this is a very blighted part of our needs in this country; it is a positive neglect in the interest of our Nation and our Government to provide any type of education for thousands and thousands of our children.
Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WIER. I yield.
Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman suggest how we might proceed in order to get additional money to cover all these projects that are eligible under the law?
Mr. WIER. If there were enough of the kind that there were over 750 applications from school districts all over the country that could qualify under the act of last year. I venture to say that the Department has today and that they on the basis of the applications that have been submitted for the education of the children that are in just as serious condition. I think in each one of these communities it will be increased.
Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, he might include certain sections of the west coast.
Mr. WIER. I was not out on the west coast; I am speaking only of the places I saw.
Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I was eager, therefore, for the Recross to show to me areas that there are areas throughout the country that are in just as serious condition. I am somewhat familiar with the situation referred to by the gentleman from Michigan and can confirm what he said. And in Richmond, Calif., where the population doubled within a few months, the city manager, speaking about the problem said:
The Government has letched our children; there are children in Richmond, junior high school who have never gone to school a full day because of lack of facilities to take care of them.
Mr. WIER. I am aware that the same situation exists in a number of places in the State of Washington: Hanford, for example, Seattle, and Portland, Ore.; and I think you could go right down the west coast to San Diego.
Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is a national problem.
Mr. WIER. It is a national problem. I made reference only to those places that I visited to show this picture in its fulness. Those who are entitled to receive more than $2,000,000 something to the Office of Education. These districts submitted a total of 21 construction projects to use up this entitlement. They requested $1,233,000 and the Federal funds for construction and pledged a total of $946,362 in local funds. The $31,500,000 available for construction under section 202 of the act will only ever 100 projects all over the Nation.
In my State, construction of school facilities on Federal property, on military installations at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox and Fort Breckinridge are now suffering from the lack of funds. I just mention these instances in Kentucky because the same situation prevails all over the country. This is a blight in our nation, but has been given for two of the military installations to proceed with construction in Kentucky while the application of the other is being held up on account of insufficiency. I think we know that Federal ownership of property reduces local tax income for school purposes, and we also know that a military installation or defense installation brings about an influx of persons into a community, resulting in an increased number of children to be educated. We are confronted with the problem, and we must solve it to the best of our ability.
The estimated requirements for temporary facilities for the next school year under section 203 of the act in two critical defense areas, Paducah and the Savannah River, the Office of Education will have very little money left for these other impacted areas all over the Nation, which goes to show that the entire amount as recommended by the committee is entirely inadequate and should be raised.
Mr. ALBERT. Does it not come down to this one proposition, that if the Office of Education has failed to make its case or the Bureau of the Budget has put a muzzle on it? The committee has informed the House that the Office of Education has not made out a case for additional money.
Mr. PERKINS. I think the latter is true. The Bureau of the Budget has not given this problem the consideration it surely deserves, and, of course, the impact is constantly getting worse on account of world conditions.
I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee in the Senate will give this
problem the utmost consideration, and that the Office of Education will also take another look at the picture. I personally believe that the appropriation contained in this bill for the purpose of taking care of the school districts in these federally impacted areas are entirely inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, as amended, $175,000,000, of which $100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted hereunder: Provided, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted here-in which is available for new obligations.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: Page 21, line 13, strike out "$175,000,000" and insert in its place the figure "$250,000,000."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is on page 21, line 13, where there is a substitution of the figure $175,000,000 to make it read $250,000,000.

I think that probably everyone here is familiar with this hospital-construction program. There was a great deal of talk about it last year, and what it is to do with is this: Originally, as I understand, there was to be $150,000,000 for such hospital construction.

As the result of the economic situation it was thought advisable to try and cut that down. Now, probably many of you have had communities where the people of the community have gone out, have raised money, have made plans to build these hospitals. I understand there is a very great need for them throughout the country.

Now, all of us here are trying to do what we can as far as economy is concerned. However, it seems to me in this situation where, as is generally agreed, the gentleman's statement is correct, that the fact the people in such facilities where, as I think all of us will readily admit, the people of the communities have gone out, have raised money, and have shown good faith in reliance on what the Government has in effect promised, that we should not go back upon our word and our responsibility. This amendment, if adopted, will, in effect, let the Government keep its word to all of the communities that acted in reliance on the Government authorization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in this amendment from the point of view that the Government has given its word. Would the gentleman elaborate on the significance of just what has been done from which he draws the inference that the Government should go back on its word on any specific sum?

Mr. FURCOLO. I have drawn that inference from the original authorization and also from the fact that in reliance upon that authorization people throughout the country in various communities went out, had bond issues, raised money, and many of them engaged architects and had plans drawn and went ahead in reliance on what they assumed actually was a representation of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Who made the representation as to what would be allowed?

Mr. FURCOLO. Well, I assume that it was made by the Congress by the original authorization and then from that I suppose by the proper governmental agencies.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGrath. The gentleman knows full well that the mere passage of an authorization bill does not commit the Government. He knows further, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that no agency or no official of any agency has any power to bind the Government just because an authorization bill has been passed.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right. The mere passage of an authorization bill has been passed, of course. In itself is not conclusive, but may I also ask the gentleman from New York this question? Is it not a fact that in reliance upon representations made by duly constituted people in the Government and as the result of the belief that this money would be forthcoming, that plans were undertaken in all communities; that people went out to raise money through bond issues, in many cases with the approval of people in the Government, that architects were engaged, and things of that nature? May I ask if that is not roughly the situation?

Mr. McGrath. My very dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FURCOLO) knows, on the premise he has set forth, what the answer would have to be.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would not the answer be "Yes"?

Mr. McGrath. No. Of course, the gentleman's facts are not correct. Because an authorization is made does not justify anyone going out and seeking to employ architects.

Mr. FURCOLO. May I ask the gentleman from New York whether or not it is not a fact that as the result of the authorization and as the result of action taken by the governmental authorities, that the people of this Nation, in various communities, in good faith, acting on the reliance of that premise, did go out and do these things that I suggested? And is it not further a fact that practically all of the members of this committee have been aware of that, but that it is as the result of economy that this cut was made? Is that not the situation?

Mr. McGrath. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. Some communities may have anticipated what would be done in the future, but in so doing they took the risk of their own decision.

Mr. FURCOLO. I think without any question the record shows, and the people in the communities throughout the Nation know, that acting in reliance upon this authorization and on local people in this Government had done, they went out in many communities and raised money, had plans drawn, and actually committed themselves in many ways, helping up the word of the Government to carry through.

Mr. Jonas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Jonas. Is the gentleman's amendment to increase the appropriation from $175,000,000 to $250,000,000? Mr. FURCOLO. Actually it is $75,000,000 more for the building.

Mr. Jonas. I am for that program. Without any question the gentleman knows that practically throughout the whole United States, in the large cities as well as in the smaller cities, there is a shortage of bed space in hospitals. The people in these communities on account of the economic crisis and the high cost of living and the high cost of building having ceased to make contributions from the standpoint of private enterprise. If we are going to do something for these hospitals in smaller cities, in the humane standpoint, we have to look to the Government. I do not call this socialism, I call it good common sense.

Mr. FURCOLO. You cannot economize too much. I agree, also from the fact that in reliance upon what they actually committed themselves in many ways, relying upon the word of the Government, to carry through, I do not call this socialism, I call it good common sense.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. On the matter of authorization, not giving anybody the right to assume that an appropriation would be made, I think, however, that all of these people who have eligible projects have just as much right to assume that their projects will be taken care of as somebody who is going to be taken care of under this appropriation bill.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree with the gentleman.

As a matter of fact, there is a little bit more here than just an authorization. There is not only an authorization but a result of authorization, people throughout this Nation, acting in reliance upon what they thought was the good faith of the Government.

No one in the Government before last year in which the dollar had already been done, indicated to them, "This is not going to be done." Whether legally or strictly or techni-
Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from New York tell the gentleman from New York what his amendment calls for an addition of $75,000,000, whereas the Budget Bureau requested only $20,000,000 additional.

Mr. FURCOLO. It is interesting that the Bureau of the Budget does not do anything different than create a rebuttable presumption in response to the gentleman from New York, he says, "This has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget." As soon as somebody wants to do something that has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, there's the danger of a challenge, and the government, the Congress or the Bureau of the Budget?

I do not say that either one is exactly right, but certainly the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget is not a decision by the Bureau of the Budget to create a rebuttable presumption. The facts here, in my opinion, justify us in overriding the Bureau of the Budget's opinion.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to thank the gentleman for offering his amendment. In the State of West Virginia we have 15 hospitals where there are no hospitals and need them very badly. In this city of Huntington, a city of about 92,000 people, we have only six beds in capacity. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in stating that there are many different cities which went out and sold bonds. In Huntington they have already raised the funds and now the funds are idle and the people have to pay interest on the funds. I think the gentleman is entirely correct and is to be commended for the kind of amendment that he has offered.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I might say this: We are not going to save any money if we do not do it now, and these facilities so urgently needed. The only thing that is going to happen is that we are going to waste some of the money that many of the people have put up in trying to provide the funds. Interest will have to be paid on that money. The cost of labor is going up and the cost of labor is going up. Some day in the very near future they are going to have to have these facilities. They will simply have to be built at some later time at a far greater cost.

I do not want to be pessimistic, but if we pay any attention at all to the fact that eventually we may need greater hospital facilities as a result, perhaps, of the action of some other nation, we cannot begin to build the facilities after that happens.

I think from every possible point of view, in keeping with the people and on the basis of truth and sound economy the amendment should be carried, and I hope it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I yield to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. Javits).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this being an appropriation bill, I should say we are very much interested in the facts. I happen to be rather a scold or I would not be taking the time of the House today.

I wrote the Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission of the State of New York, and I have a letter from Dr. John J. Bourke, telling me just what the situation is in New York. I think the House ought to know it because I believe it does justice to the facts and these facts are important in determining our policy of hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act by the Federal establishment. I have no illusions as to the desire of the House to vote a $75,000,000 Committee. But I think the facts are important in determining our policy upon appropriations and what I am going to talk about now relates to the policy that this appropriation ought to be more adequate.

In New York State the commission has authorized 62 Hill-Burton projects—on 54 of which work is proceeding—which call for an expenditure—and this is a very important matter to economy advocates—of $54,000,000 but of which the Federal Government is only going to contribute one-third. So difficult has the situation been for the State of New York, by allowances which have been made available to it under Hill-Burton appropriations made last year which were very sharply cut, that it has had to put hospitals in a split basis, telling the hospitals to go ahead and proceed with their construction in the expectation that they will get allocations from the Federal Government.

As a result of that situation the State of New York is faced, if it gets its part of what is provided for in this bill, with an allowance from Federal funds of three and a half million dollars this year, but 2 1/2 million dollars are already devoted to going projects and it will only leave the whole State of New York about $900,000 for other projects.

The executive director of New York State's Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission tells me in New York City alone 20 to 25 million dollars are needed as Hill-Burton contributions for hospitals are a necessity to the community. In Nassau County right outside of New York City, $2,000,000 are needed on the basis of estimated costs and a 5% interest, which may interest my colleague from New York, $1,750,000 is needed on the same basis.

Mr. Chairman, the point is simply this, that building hospitals is not inflationary. Building hospitals is essential to our national security and national safety. Building hospitals represents an asset which is better than money and a great deal better than the gold buried in the ground at Fort Knox, and represents the creation of an asset and putting some of our resources into an asset vital to the future of our people. It is for this reason that I am going to support the benefit of the people of the State of New York or of any other State, and certainly it is essential to our national defense. When the program is established by as strong an authority as the New York State's Joint Hospital Survey Commission which finds it is needed and can be put insufficiently supplied under existing law despite the fact that two-thirds of the money comes from State and local sources, and when they emphasize that most of these hospitals, 83 percent of them, are voluntary nonprofit, nondenominational, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish hospitals, the program appears to be eminently justified. You are not creating new Government facilities here but rather making it possible for Americans by voluntary means to help themselves.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HALE. There are several hospitals in Maine which are left stranded by the failure to appropriate adequately under this hospital legislation, the Hill-Burton Act, and Hill-Burton funds there were started on the faith of this legislation. These partially completed projects certainly merit some consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me we are here not only to save money but we are here to appropriate money where the money is deserved. That is our duty and that is our responsibility. It is clear, both on the grounds of solid benefit to the country and on the grounds of national defense, that we ought to have an attitude of greater consideration with respect to the hospital provision of this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very popular proposal. There are a great many fine things proposed in this bill but I would like to go along with them. A lot of folks in my own country need hospitals but I wonder if we cannot stop and look and listen this
morning, and think about the ever-all question of the state of the economy of this Nation and what is going to happen if we yield to every request that comes here to do some of these fine things that we can do today.

We have been talking about economy here. You hear a lot about economy. Every man who gets up to offer an amendment says, "I am for economy but..." I am for the other side," I spoke to one of my colleagues the other day in the cloakroom, and I said, "Now I think we have all got to sacrifice a little bit if we are going to balance the budget, if we are going to stop piling these taxes onto the people that they cannot pay. We are going to have to cut and cut everywhere." My friend said something that is typical of the situation. He said, "Yes, Judge; I am for doing it, and I will give them the very shirt off your back." Is that what we are going to do here? I am for cutting these appropriations in every way, and I am going to try to have the courage to stand up here and vote to do it. And if it hurts me in my district it is going to have to hurt you. Are you going to do about these things? They are going to be coming up every minute in the day on every appropriation bill that comes up. They are things that you would like your people to have, but can we stop and think about the sad state of the budget of this Nation, and whether we are going to continue to run a deficit, whether we are going to continue to pile up taxes to the point where the people cannot pay them? Let us think about this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to publicly commend the gentleman for the position he has taken. He is entirely right in having the courage to stand up here. It is time that instead of voting to increase appropriations the House should vote to cut them further than they actually have been cut by our Appropriations Committee. The American people are demanding economy in Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. Let us do it on this bill and all the rest of them as they come along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Bushey] is recognized.

Mr. BUSHEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no argument on the question as to whether or not it would be a fine thing to build more hospitals for our country. There are other equally important matters to be taken into consideration on this appropriation in addition to economy.

The gentleman's amendment boosts the appropriation by $165,000,000. That is far more than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations held extensive hearings. The testimony which was received on this appropriation will be found beginning on page 633 of the printed hearing. But here is the problem with which we are confronted. Even if they had this $250,000,000, under the defense emergency program they could not possibly get the material to build the hospitals. Furthermore, our trained services on the doctors and hospital personnel of our country has created a tremendous shortage in these professions. Furthermore, if we go ahead with these hospitals, they could not possibly get the doctors and personnel to staff them. These are some of the major circumstances you have to take into consideration when considering boosting this appropriation $75,000,000.

Every Member of this House is getting letters from his district asking him to cut the budget, to economize. You are going to get a lot more letters next year when the people get their new tax bill and wonder why you do not decrease appropriations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSHEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does my colleague from Illinois take it that the additional appropriation of $55,000,000 will completely overthrow, disrupt, and destroy the whole economic background of this country when we here every day are pouring billions for war, billions for munitions, billions for outside questions, billions for appropriations to foreign countries, yet if we talk about spending $55,000,000 for the sick, the indigent and suffering people of America it will ruin the country?

Mr. BUSHEY. I do not take that position. If the gentleman from Illinois wants to take it he can, but I do not. There are a lot of hospitals already authorized which we have appropriated some money, and new ones that have been contracted for. Furthermore, there is the necessity to build all these hospitals in all the communities of the country. Not but that it is good, but in the last few years we have had hospitalization and hospital promotion groups, and it has been so oversold that the people of the communities cannot afford to support them.

Mr. JONAS. Does the gentleman know that these hospital promotion programs have all fallen by the wayside and are gradually disappearing? Does he not know that the hospitals we now have cannot take care of the sick people because of the local communities find the burden too heavy to bear? It has gotten to be a national program; the National Government has said in the construction of more hospitals.

Mr. BUSHEY. I will ask the gentleman a question: What is the sense of appropriating money when you cannot get the materials or the personnel with which to staff the hospitals if they are built?

Mr. JONAS. It is a sad commentary upon the intelligence of thinking people to put forth the proposition that we cannot spare material to aid the sick and suffering. If that be the case, then it is about time that we made a change in the program and paid some attention to the sick.

Mr. BUSHEY. I stand with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith]: You are either going to be economy-minded, or you are not going to be economy-minded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman from Virginia has well stated that we cannot afford at this time to accept any amendments to this bill which would increase the total of the money carried in the bill. We are in a very difficult position financially, and I cannot vote for an increase, even though it is for one of the most worthy projects such as aid to hospital construction. There are many things which are very desirable but which cannot be pushed as rapidly as we would like at a time like this, when we are threatened with an all-out war. I would like, however, to amend the Appropriation in the form of a substitute for the gentleman's amendment agreed to whereby we could provide in this bill that priority shall be given to the various construction projects to those projects which are most advanced at this time in planning and financing. It is my intention to offer such an amendment.

Please allow me to call to your attention what the good people of one of my communities, Madison, Minn., have been up against in their wish to secure a much-needed hospital.

In December 1949 public-spirited citizens of that community worked hard to raise funds for Madison's contribution to the hospital. A total of 1,695 contributors pledged $186,044 and the project seemed to be well on the way. On March 15, 1950, that community was informed by the Minnesota Department of Health that the project had been killed.

We have now decided that we will include general hospital projects on the 1950 construction schedule down to and including those projects which were developed and projects which are not as yet available to the State, we cannot en­ courage funds for the 1951 fiscal allotment becomes available, which should be about July 1, 1950.

Naturally, the Madison community looked forward hopefully to the summer of 1950 for their plans for a new hospital to become a reality. Plans and specifi­ cations were developed and a total of $38,000 was spent by the hospital board for site, architects' fees, and such. No Federal money, however, was available and today this project lies dormant, a year after having been virtually assured that construction would commence last July.

Members of the House, place yourselves in the positions of members of that hospital board. What can they say to the 1,005 contributors who 17 months ago put up $186,044 on the promise contained in the Hill-Burton Act, that the Federal Government would aid in giving them a hospital and now in 1951 the present fire trap constructed in 1900. Ten thousand people in that county...
Mr. BUSBEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentle­man from New York.

Mr. BUSBEE. If the gentleman will read the table in the hearings, he will find that the smaller communities as such have received the bulk of the money rather than the larger cities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That may appear to be the case but the facts remain that there seems to be no money available now for this project. The gentleman will recall that we had a supplemental hearing before the Bureau of Public Health last December on this very issue. There the question came up as to how much money would be required in order to get under the gentleman from New York.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I am simply urging that we make sure that the $228,000 will be available. No definite priority is in this bill for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. I call to the attention of the gentleman that the allotment for his State of Minnesota is $1,520,000 and that the item to which he refers in the bills for about $228,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I am simply urging that we make sure that the $228,000 will be available. No definite priority is in this bill for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. In this bill there is sufficient allotment and that project to which he refers will be taken care of under this appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman could assure me that this $228,000 will be available. There are so many turns and twists in the road that I fear that small hospitals such as Madison will be at the bottom of the list, while large hospitals already under construction will secure more than their previously allocated share, so as to be rushed to completion in spite of the cost of materials and labors going up 15 to 20 percent the past year. It is because of this reasoning, that I propose to offer an amendment to give priority to the many small hospitals, of which Madison is but an example.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the interest I have naturally in my own project at Madison, I want to reiterate that I cannot speak to this bill today. We can, however, help in seeing to it that the various States allocate their share of the pending $75,000,000 in such a way as to again restore faith in Uncle Sam's promise. Communities which have shown their good faith through planning and laying down their commitments should be given first consideration in this distribution of the money available this coming July 1, under the Hill-Burton Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. McGRATH).

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I recognize at the outset that to speak against a construction program for hospitals is not a very popular thing. Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman that I am very much disturbed about the amendment which proposes an increase from $75,000,000 in appropriations to $250,000,000. The country cannot afford any more than it has at present. They were able to take care of the coming last year with the $175,000,000 and they will be able to do the same thing next year.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy, but I am not in favor of cutting appropriations. I believe the pending amendment proposing to increase hospital funds should be agreed to. Hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act to my way of thinking, has made a great contribution in promoting the general welfare of the people in this country. As a result of this legislation, hospital treatment has been provided for the sick and indigent where otherwise such treatment would have been impossible. Many sections of our country still need hospitals and the people residing in those districts are looking into the future with the hope that they may be able to acquire funds under the Hill-Burton Act and construct needed hospitals.

In my district last fall one of the large counties voted by a majority of approximately 9,000 to 400 in favor of a hospital bond issue in order that they may be in a position to match funds provided under the Hill-Burton Act. The construction of this hospital in Floyd County, Ky., will require $300,000 of Hill-Burton funds besides the one-third that the county is authorized to pay. It is put up to be matched for the preparation of plans for this hospital. The project has been approved by the State Department of Health and by the United States Public Health Service. The hospital is badly needed, and when completed and properly equipped, will serve a great area in the Big Sandy Valley. The people of Floyd County are very hospitable. They may be completed in the near future. From a defense standpoint these hospitals that have been authorized should be completed. I mention this particular hospital, although there are numerous similar situations throughout the country. I personally fear that $75,-000,000 provided for in the appropriations bill for new construction is inadequate. For that reason, I support the amendment to increase the appropriations bill for new construction.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the committee unanimously allowed the full budget estimate of $75,000,000 for construction. One hundred million dollars goes to pay off contract authorizations and the additional $75,000,000 goes for new construction. As of January 1, 1951, there was a total of 1,497, roughly 1,500 projects that had been approved embracing about 73,000 beds and 225 community Public Health centers. We recognize at this time the difficulty of getting materials and because of that fact among others this appropriation has been held to this amount. I call your attention to the fact that at the present time there is no money to be spent on new hospital construction going on in the country. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Fy Connor) said the original bill perhaps a moral obligation upon the Federal Government because there had been an authorization bill passed. Of course, the fallacy of that reasoning, I think, was pointed out very well by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KRATZEN) because if that was to follow, every time you passed an authorization bill you might just as well put in the appropriation at the same time and eliminate any examination as to whether or not the money should be allocated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Fy Connor: Page 21, line 19, after "obligations" strike out the period and insert "Provided, That the funds provided for herein shall be used on a basis of priority to those projects most advanced in the planning and financing as determined by the secretary of the Treasury."
to the States and therefore this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane. Being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that brought this legislation to the House authorizing this program, I recall that my amendment was adopted in that authorization program which left administration of the funds to the States, after the funds were made available. The authority to determine the utilization of the funds made available for the carrying out of this program is left to the States. Should a limitation such as the gentleman offered here be adopted, that would mean we would deviate from that policy established under the authorization of the program and consequently I think it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the Chair permit a further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Chair will notice in line 16 the provision "That allotments under such part will not exceed 1,500 regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States (31 U. S. C. 222, h; 43 U. S. C. 313); and for 6 months' death gratuity pay and burial allowance of regular commissioned officers $1,900,000, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made available to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Davis of Georgia: On page 26, line 8, strike out "$1,900,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$1,790,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this item appears in the committee report on page 34 in the table entitled "Title II—Federal Security Agency." It is the same as the item of the pay for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States and for 6 months' death gratuity pay and burial allowance of regular commissioned officers. In 1951 the amount appropriated for this item was $1,790,000. The amount in this bill is increased $100,000. The subcommittee has done good work, but in my opinion this bill is increased in a number of ways and for that I wish to commend them and wish to say that I concur in that action. I feel, if it is possible to do so, no item in the bill should be increased. When I noticed the $110,000 increase here I looked in the committee report to see what the justification for it was, and not finding any reference to it whatever I then discussed it with the subcommittee chairman and was informed that the justification for it is set out on pages 839, 840, and 841 of the committee report for this particular agency and that this $110,000 is supposed to pay for the retirement which is anticipated during the fiscal year of 19 commissioned officers. The testimony of Dr. Glines with reference to that is as follows:

The estimated increase is due to provision for retirement of 19 additional officers. In view of the retirement of 19 additional officers for pay, uniforms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed 1,500 regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States (31 U. S. C. 222, h; 43 U. S. C. 313); and for 6 months' death gratuity pay and burial allowance of regular commissioned officers $1,900,000, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made available to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I add to what I have already said that this is an agency in which the Williams subcommittee in its investiga-
gation found that in the Federal Security Administration they maintained a purchasing operations division which employed 197 employees which processed a total number of orders per year of 121,614, 50 percent of which were under $20 each, at an average cost of $5 per order processed, and the number processed, the daily average per employee, was $77, and this fact shows me that we could do to lower the number of people for whom we now have to supply nurses and doctors and others.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other similar things that could be done in various parts of our field of research. May I urge upon the Members of this body, and especially upon whatever subcommittee has to do not only with the health appropriations but also with the health department and various health measures that come to this Congress usually through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would urge upon the subcommittee some very fundamental study between now and the next session of this Congress. It is evident that we must reduce expenditures. Let us reduce them in such ways that will bring benefit to our people rather than having to reduce them by having fewer hospitals than are now needed to care for our sick, for the 250,000 GI's who are born at war, and for other tragedies of our civilization. Let us see what we can do to do away with the causes, let us not go on forever dealing merely with results of poor management.

I urge this, Mr. Chairman, and hope very much that during this next year because of very necessity we will force ourselves to look into these matters from this more· broad viewpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many Members have done, I have spent a great many years of my life in the areas of health and disease. May I say that I am very happy that you have seen fit not to make an additional cut in the mental hygiene Appropriation.

I am taking these few minutes, Mr. Chairman, in order to suggest to you that it is time for us, as guardians of the government, to consider as possible fields to refer the older Members of the House rather dramatically killed by glandular activity. If you look at a bill which I introduced some years ago to iodize salt to make readily available to the great masses of our people the ingredient necessary to health of body and mind in order to reduce the number of feeble-minded, mentally unfit, deformed, and such that we are breeding in increasing numbers. My bill was rather dramatically killed by a parliamentary procedure on the floor, which prevented its coming to a vote. Did you know that a single soldier who went into the Army in the last war had nothing but iodized salt?

It has been definitely established by 30 years of research that iodine is absolutely necessary to sanity and healthful glandular activity. If you put two bricks of salt in a field, one iodized and one not, the cows will take the iodized salt every time; I could give you many illustrations of that nature.

Also, one of our South American Republics was virtually free of goiter or thyroid trouble. Then suddenly they began to have it. One of the research men was sent down from here at the request of their government. He found that the goiter began at the time when a very up and coming fellow had come per year to the United States and liked the white salt on our tables. When he returned home he set up a factory and refined the salt, and goiterers appeared.

You may give this to us as an illustration of what basic research can teach us. Assuring the masses of our people a requisite amount of this necessary ingredient is one of the things that we could do to lower the number of people who have it.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make that rather dramatically killed by glandular activity. If you look at a bill which I introduced some years ago to iodize salt to make readily available to the great masses of our people the ingredient necessary to health of body and mind in order to reduce the number of feeble-minded, mentally unfit, deformed, and such that we are breeding in increasing numbers. My bill was rather dramatically killed by a parliamentary procedure on the floor, which prevented its coming to a vote. Did you know that a single soldier who went into the Army in the last war had nothing but iodized salt?

It has been definitely established by 30 years of research that iodine is absolutely necessary to sanity and healthful glandular activity. If you put two bricks of salt in a field, one iodized and one not, the cows will take the iodized salt every time; I could give you many illustrations of that nature.

Also, one of our South American Republics was virtually free of goiter or thyroid trouble. Then suddenly they began to have it. One of the research men was sent down from here at the request of their government. He found that the goiter began at the time when a very up and coming fellow had come per year to the United States and liked the white salt on our tables. When he returned home he set up a factory and refined the salt, and goiterers appeared.

You may give this to us as an illustration of what basic research can teach us. Assuring the masses of our people a requisite amount of this necessary ingredient is one of the things that we could do to lower the number of people who have it.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make that
especially goiters, affects an individual's mind. I want to say to the gentleman from Maine that his rain comes from the sea. His area is fairly well supplied with iodine. But when you get to certain areas where the water does not come from the sea you will find the reverse to be true. I made an investigation, and I will not say that they recorded 100 percent of the school children in a certain city as being affected with thyroid trouble.

This is one of the most serious questions that has come before the Congress, and I am telling you now that I do not believe you can ever cure it with iodized salt, although it does have a beneficial effect. If you will eat the foods that come from that part of the South where the soil is saturated with iodine, you will find it to be a great deterrent to the contraction and development of goiter, one of the most dangerous diseases in America.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes, and that 2 minutes be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. VERSIELL).

Mr. VERSIELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to reduce this appropriation bill further, by $110,000.

First, however, I want to compliment and commend the members of the Appropriations Committee that has shown such a tenacity for economy in Government at a time when it was never more needed than it is in this particular session of the Congress. I also want to commend all of the members of the committee of the House who have helped defeat the prior amendment which would have increased this appropriation bill by $75,000,000.

The people of our country are greatly concerned. I think the letters that are coming in, even those before the MacArthur incident, indicate that the people are concerned about the future of this Government and concerned about what the Congress may do, whether or not they, the citizens of the United States who really are the Government, may get a measure of relief from the Congress of the United States.

They are more concerned now than they were ever before, and they are looking to Congress now with greater intensity and greater hope, and may I say greater concern, than ever before. Congress has made a splendid start in acting upon the appropriation bills that have come before this body recently. We can give the people some consolation and some hope for the future that no other person in government can give them. We are so intensely hoping for if we continue to show them that we are trying to protest their interest and continue to show them that we will continue to stand fast for economy throughout this session.

I know there are likely to be those who will offer amendments to this bill, and I undo the work this splendid committee has done, to increase the appropriations, later on as we read the bill. I want to speak to you now and urge the Members of the Congress of the United States to defeat every attempt to increase appropriations in this bill, and I hope that we will indicate our determination to do that by reducing this bill more by $110,000 by approving this amendment.

We can give the people hope and consolation if we continue to stand fast for economy on the floor of this House not only for this bill, but as the days and weeks come. When we reduce spending, we lighten the tax load that much on the people. Congress has a great responsibility. You Members of the House have shown an inclination to measure up and face up to that responsibility. I hope we may continue to do so today and throughout this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY).

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has given careful consideration to the agencies that have appeared before it over a period of several weeks. You will notice in the tabulation at the back of the report that practically every estimate that was presented to the committee has been cut for fiscal year 1952. But I believe the significant thing in the report is that this committee cut practically every agency that appeared before it below what they had available in 1951—not the estimate, but we have cut below what they had to operate with in 1951. This relatively small item for commissioned officers' pay is one of the few items that always shows an increase over last year. It shows an increase of $110,000. That entire increase is made up of one thing, and that is for survivors' benefits. Congress has made a splendid start in the Public Health Service and for survivors' benefits. That is all there is to it. It does not add any jobs to the Public Health rolls. That $110,000 is made up completely of retirement pay for officers serving in the Public Health Service on the same basis as officers in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Coast Guard, and for survivors' benefits; for the survivors of those officers who have died whose survivors are eligible to receive benefits. That is what the entire $110,000 amounts to. That is why we allowed it because we can do anything else. There is in the record a table showing the net increase of retired officers from 1947 to 1952. In 1947 there was a net increase of 28; in 1948, 12; in 1949, 16; in 1950, 28; and in 1951, 32.

This next fiscal year, by the figures that we have, there will be 19 additional officers retired. This $110,000 will go to meet that retirement pay and the benefits that will be allowed for the survivors of the officers who died.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, if they could reduce some unnecessary employees, however, and save $110,000 they could use that money to pay this retirement, could they not? Mr. FOGARTY. The $110,000 increase is mainly and solely for the purpose of paying retirement benefits to officers who have been retired in service and to pay survivors' benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the others in congratulating the chairman of this subcommittee on the work he has done in the interest of Government economy. However, I am not prepared to concede that any cuts are not possible. In this particular instance, may I ask the gentleman if the committee's figures in their appropriations for this commissioned officers service contemplate the continued ratio of all personnel employees to over-all employment of 1 to 30? What the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia intends to do is eliminate that elaborate and costly personnel ratio.

Mr. FOGARTY. The $110,000 increase is mainly and solely for the purpose of paying retirement benefits to officers who have been retired in service and to pay survivors' benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That may be well and good, but do you intend to continue personnel employment at the ratio of 1 to 30 employees in the agency?

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to the gentleman, who has served as chairman of the special subcommittee investigating some of these Federal agencies, that we have had his report committee in connection with the Department of Labor, especially the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but it was not until this afternoon, until the gentleman from Georgia brought this particular portion of the report to my attention, that the committee knew anything about this part of it at all. If it had been brought specifically to our attention during our hearings we would have gone into it as we did into the other report on the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But let us not cut this $110,000. I will guarantee that we will go into it in our hearings next year in view of the report the gentleman has issued. If we had had that item brought specifically to our attention, we would have brought it, but let us not cut out survivors' benefits and retired pay under this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Davis).
The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Davis of Georgia) there were—aye 66, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, $1,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 38, line 23, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,468,400."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this agency shows an enormous increase in the number of employees at a time when outside employment ought to diminish their requirements?

Mr. KEATING. I think exactly what the gentleman has said is true. The record indicates the average number of employees in this agency for 1951 was 264, and for 1952 the estimated number for 1951 is 373, and the estimated number for 1952 is 318. All of this is happening at the very time when there should be less need for public assistance and at a time when there is a real shortage in the labor market and fewer people are on public assistance, and consequently the workload to administer the program is less.

I call attention to the record wherein the gentleman from Rhode Island inquired of the witness, who was appearing on this particular item:

In this tight labor market we are in at the present time, does it not seem that a downward trend for aid to dependent children would continue?

And the witness said that it might. Further, she said:

I do not think all the States have done a thorough job in canvassing all their recipients as yet so there will probably be a continuing decrease in old-age and aid to dependent children because of certain amendments.

We all understood the need to make adequate provision for this activity, but here is a case, similar to the one we just passed upon, where the committee has increased the figure above the figure for last year at a time when the trend in the country, insofar as employment goes, is up.

I want to echo what was said by the gentleman from Georgia in complimenting the committee on the many instances where they have made substantial reductions. I think perhaps the experiences we have had on the floor with reference to the previous appropriation bill which we considered a short while ago has had a salutary effect on the entire committee. I am happy to see certain of these figures which have been made, which are so necessary in these times of unusual defense expenditures. However, I hope that, like the previous amendment, this amendment will be accepted so that at least we will not, by the action we take, increase the amounts allowed over the amounts appropriated last year for these administrative purposes.

I cannot understand why there should be need for additional employees. The alleged justification for this item appears on page 18 of the report, where it says it is to take care of within-grade salary advancements and positions which were approved for a portion of the current year to a full-year basis, and additional expenses to handle increased work arising out of certain amendments.

It is not true that it is intended to increase the number of employees. However, it seems to me that in this particular activity it is definitely one of those cases where, instead of increasing the appropriation to take care of promotions, and that sort of thing, such needs should be absorbed and taken care of by a reduction in the number of personnel. As a matter of fact, I think I have probably been unduly conservative in merely trying to reduce this figure to the figure of last year. Certainly we should do that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman wants to consider the fact that in the Federal Security structure throughout the average wage or salary is $4,500 a year, whereas in all other governmental departments the average is only $3,600, so we can take that into consideration in voting for the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I agree with that. I would say to the gentleman along that line that my figures indicate that the average salary in this agency is $4,908. It is estimated that the reduction which is sought by this amendment might eliminate 27 employees from the payroll, but that elimination would still leave on the payroll 22 more employees than they had in 1950.

In these times, in that type of activity, important as it is, it seems to me it would be inexcusable for us to allow them a larger sum than they were permitted to have last year. There are still large defense reductions in nondefense spending so necessary to the maintenance of a sound economy, and, I might add, so essential in the long run to our triumph over the forces of those who would destroy us, such action must be taken on items like the one to which this amendment is directed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask the chair of the committee what the average money is for each child in a dependent family.

Mr. FOgartY. In 1950 the average monthly money for families was $62,076; in 1951, estimated at 665,000, and in 1952, estimated at $655,000. The average monthly payment was $72.02 in 1950; $72.50 estimated in 1951, and $74.25 estimated in 1952.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is per family?

Mr. FOgarTY. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It seems to me that this is a fair amendment. We have in every town, in the State that I come from at least, a welfare agent in each city and town, however big it is, more help than is necessary. Then the State comes in with their staff of investigators and people looking for welfare. Then we have the United States coming in with a right to because they pay half; so we have three sets of people doing one man's job.

I know plenty of cases in my State where men have died or have left their families, men who were making about $40 a week, men with six children. When he runs off, or dies, that family in many cases gets $84 a week, $44 more than the man ever brought to the family; and the family was getting along very well on the $40.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that those cases ought not to be acted on the same, whether there be three children in the family or eight, because it does not cost any more to heat a house for the eight than for the three; and a lot of other expenses are of the same nature, and, and, and everything else, yet they have a policy of doing this for everybody, no matter what his condition may be or the condition the family might be in.

I do not and I do believe the amendment is fair as far as I can see to increase the number of investigators or the people going around to take care of these funds, because we have altogether too many now; one is enough. In the town I live in, a town of 7,000 people, we know the conditions of practically everybody who gets old-age assistance, or is on public relief or who receives a subsidy for dependent children; and there is no earthly need of anybody coming in from the State and then on top of that from the Federal Government overriding what the local agency does.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. The gentleman is bringing up a point which I think is very important; namely, the secrecy provisions of the Federal Security Act. Until they are amended to allow the States to publish this information so that the general public can find out about these billions we are pouring out it makes it very difficult to enforce. Our State of Indiana has already done that at their own risk of having these appropriations cut off. I now have a bill, H. R. 3720, which deals with the House committee which proposes an amendment so that these facts may be published and so that more economy will result.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am certain that these things ought to be changed. We are supposed to be living in a prosperous country, yet here we are appropriating a billion and a quarter
which the towns and cities will have to match.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will bring the Bureau's appropriation back to what they had to operate with in the fiscal year 1951. You will notice that they requested $224,600 more in fiscal 1952 than they had in fiscal 1951. This committee cut that request by about $98,000. I think in things like this we have got to bear with the operations of the agency to some extent. The Ransmeck promotions, social-security taxes, and so forth, will amount to $28,520. Bringing up to a full-year basis of this year's increase allowed them in fiscal 1951 will be another $35,000. There is $63,500 right there of the $136,600 that we allowed them. If this amendment prevails, they would have to cut below the 1951 level.

Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1950 which meant that you were putting a greater work load on this particular agency by your action in bringing for the liberalization of social security. As a consequence, they came in last year with a deficiency request, and as I recall, the Senate allowed them $250,000 to hire additional personnel to perform the duties that this Congress said they should perform in connection with their work with the various States in carrying out this program. The House did not go along with that increase of $250,000 increase last year, but it was cut down to $50,000, and only provided them 14 additional positions to work with these new amendments.

Here are some of the things they are up against now. The Bureau will have approximately one and one-half positions to perform the various activities for each State program this coming year as they had in positions last year.

In the past year, 1950, to accomplish the work of the liberalized amendments to the Social Security Act, the Bureau staff was required to work 2,900 hours of recorded overtime which they paid for during the period from July 1 to December 9, 1950, and an equivalent number of hours of unrecorded overtime performed by the top staff who received no overtime pay.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, ever since I have been on it, and the Senate has also done the same thing, has complimented the administration of this program. In 1950 Congress took action to liberalize the Social Security Act, which meant that they were putting on the shoulders of those people added responsibility they did not theretofore have.

If we are going to vote year after year to liberalize existing legislation, and to liberalize programs, I do not know what you are going to expect the agency to work with less than it had before. That is what this amendment will do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I ask unanimous consent that I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In the questions which the gentleman from Rhode Island asked in committee, and I compliment him on the knowledge and the careful way in which he elicted this answer:

We are estimating 4 percent less in 1952 on old-age assistance and 11 percent less on aid to dependent children.

It seems to me to follow from that that with a lower workload they should at least not have a greater appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was not talking about administrative expenses, as I remember, in that question. I was talking about the grants-to-State program under that $1,200,000,000. We were trying to get down to that. We knew at the time of the administrative set-up, we know of the requests they made a year before it became liberalized, social-security benefits and that they needed additional personnel. They could not get what they asked for and as a result their backlog grew up, and even though their request shows only an increase of 13 percent, the workload has been put on them by Congress has increased by 30 percent. That fact is shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEATING).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 74, noes 62.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 96, noes 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of the Administrator, $2,279,000, together with not to exceed $450,000 to be transferred from Social Security and survivors insurance trust fund: Provided, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Williams of Mississippi: Page 31, line 6, after "Administrator", strike out "$2,279,000" and insert "$2,050,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It cuts $229,000 from the funds appropriated to the Office of the Administrator, $2,050,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I believe, to be justified in view of the findings of the subcommittee which I had the privilege to head last year, whose duty it was to make a study of the utilization of personnel in the executive agencies.

There are very many reasons why this amount should be cut. Perhaps it should be somewhat smaller.

In the Office of the Administrator we found the ratio of personnel employees to total employment to be 1 personnel employee to 30 employees in the Agency. That is not a result in my judgment the personnel problems of 20 people in the Agency. It is my understanding that in private business the ratio of personnel employees to over-all employment runs far above 1 to 150. There is no reason why Government personnel offices should not at least approach that ratio.

I may say also that we uncovered a report of the Federal Security Agency, embodied in the appendix of our report, which was startling. It shows that Mr. Ewing and Mr. Altmeier spent thousands of Government dollars in visiting England and other countries where social medicine is practiced. Mr. Altmeier even went to New Zealand. They came back and made a very elaborate report, but that here is one place where we can save for the taxpayers. I may say further i. e. my understanding that out of the appropriations to the Office of the Administrator are taken these so-called slush funds with which these $50-a-day consultants are hired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman's amendment is in order, and I want to commend him on the splendid service he rendered as chairman of the subcommittee during the last year investigating the expenditures of this agency. In view of the report that was made as a result of the cut made by the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of that committee, I think his amendment is in order and should be approved.

In my judgment, that agency last year and the year before spent a great deal more funds than were absolutely necessary. This is a case where they can save a part of the funds that have been allocated to them and still do a better job. I think the gentleman will recall the hearings held by the committee disclose that in many instances they could have done much better work if they had not had quite so many employees in their service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Kansas, whose efforts contributed materially to the success of our committee last year. I do not think there is any need to discuss this amendment further. The mere fact that it takes funds out of the office of Mr. Ewing, I think, makes it in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on
this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is again an instance where another committee has been investigating some of the various agencies and has not brought it to the specific attention of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I might say to the gentleman that copies of all of our reports were sent to each member, and the subcommittee on appropriations individually at the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress and also were provided to employees of the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only thing I can say about that is that many Members of Congress probably do not read all reports that are sent to them and perhaps they went into the wastepaper basket like the funds from these efforts. I think such matters should be brought to their attention specifically and should be brought especially to the attention of the subcommittee handling the appropriations involved, and we would look into these things.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a very popular thing to call Oscar Ewing's appropriation to be conserving. It is the sun and it is new for this so-called Williams committee to be accusing Oscar Ewing of promoting socialized medicine, but before the Williams committee was ever formed, the subcommittee on appropriations that had been appropriating funds since Oscar Ewing has been Federal Security Administrator has been doing its job in the proper way and there is not anything new for this House that has been as rough on Oscar Ewing's appropriation as this subcommittee has been.

Every year they have cut his appropriation rather severely and it was at the request of this very same committee 4 years ago when George Schwarcz was on the committee, when the Republicans had control, and when Frank Keefe was the chairman of the committee, that they reorganized the top level of the Federal Security Agency. I said on the floor, at that time, that I did not think it was a good thing to do. A year later, we had to admit in all sincerity and honesty that it was a good thing the way it worked out. They saved money. They saved a great deal of money and eliminated many positions. This year we were a little bit behind. We cut them $850,000 under the estimate, which is also a cut below what they had for 1951. It is not only a cut below the estimate, but a cut below what he had in 1951. If you go back to 1951 you will see his agency was also hit hard last year in our report and in our appropriation bill.

What are we doing with an amendment like this? You have field offices all over the country. Is there any breakdown of this pending $229,000 decrease? Not a bit. That is the type of legislation you are getting here. When Members offer amendments they do not know just what part of the service will come under it. For example, $229,000 to be a cut out of the field offices. If you vote for this amendment, he can apply it there. He can make a cut against every field office throughout the country and not touch his own. But if we in the committee, if you will read the committee report, provided that none of the committee cut shall be applied to any regional office. We want those regional offices kept intact, and we applied the cut against his own specific offices here in Washington. That is the reasonable way to do it, if you want to make cuts in Federal expenditures. You should find out where the cuts should be made and demand that they be made in those particular places.

We say in our report:

"Activities embraced include general executive direction, program coordination, field services, including management and housekeeping costs in agency regional offices . . ."

Which takes in every regional office in the country, and which includes staff, publications and reports, and administrative services at the agency level.

But we spelled out in our report exactly where we wanted the cut made.

He wanted two additional positions for program coordination and development. He wanted them a year ago, but we did not give them to him this year and we refused to give them to him.

We say further in this report:

For the past 2 years the committee has denied increases for this on the basis that it saw no justification for enlarging the staff, and there is essentially nothing new in the picture at this point. The cut is also directed at the items for general administration, and direction, publications and reports, the merit system staff, and administrative services.

That comes under his immediate offices.

These groups can stand a cut without impairing essential staff and services at these levels, provided that the most effective use of the staff and all nonessentials are dispensed with.

Now, this committee, on its own initiative, under Republican administration in the Eightieth Congress, took the initial step to reorganize this agency. They saved the taxpayers considerable sums, and they did it in a scientific way.

They knew what they were doing. I disagreed with them at that time, but I had to subsequently admit they were right. We have given this thing thorough consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On page 19 of the committee's report you will find this statement:

"Flory prepared for the Federal Security Agency is not a defense agency."

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is there any reason why Mr. Ewing cannot be retained here with the rest of the American public?

Mr. FOGARTY. When we cut him a year ago—if you will go back and see what we cut him in 1951—you will notice that in the past 3 or 4 years he has been cut every year. Our bill for 1953 cuts him below what he had in 1951. If you will go over every other agency and do what you have done in this one, you will get real economy and get it in an intelligent way. Are you proposing to do it in this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Foggarty] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Williams of Mississippi) there were—ayes 101, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations. For expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and purchase of one vehicle for replacement only: $711,500, together with not to exceed $125,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

The Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are considering appropriations for these various agencies I should like to say that on the news ticker in the Speaker's lobby is shown the statement of the Treasury of the United States at this period. In it there is an item which interests me greatly, and I cannot find any explanation for it; perhaps the appropriate witness in the Treasury, as the Speaker shows that on the 17th day of April 1950, the gold supply of the United States, I suppose that means in Fort Knox and the Federal Reserve bank, was $24,246,684.051.28; and this year on the 16th of April, a year later, it is $21,808,606.160.71.

That shows a drop in the gold stocks of the United States of $2,440,074,690.57 in 1 year.

I would like to know where that gold has gone and why.

And I will ask you that you call the treasurers of the United States; I think a fair average is on the order of $57 an ounce throughout the rest of the world, while our price is $35 an ounce. If you took $2,440,000,000 worth of gold which is about 2,400 tons of gold, and sold it in foreign markets for what you could get for it you would make about a 60 percent profit, and that profit would be about $1,450,000,000. Now, while we are talking about cutting appropriations by $110,000 or something of that sort in order to save some of the taxpayers' money, perhaps we ought to find out what has happened to the billion­odd dollars worth of gold that was in Fort Knox last year and is not there now.
I suggest that the appropriate committees of this House make inquiry—which it is all right, but it is not in the United States Government Treasury and I know it is in none of your pockets, because you all have the law that you are to have it. The only place I can think of that it might have gone is abroad; and have it. The only place I can think of you do not ship a without somebody finding out about it. That is a lot of gold; that is one-tenth of the whole. 's, at what price was it used to be backing up some of this in the foreign market and that is a around the United States, the green United States "lettuce," to the war we had something like $27, $26,000,000,000. Amount; but now it is down to twenty millions, I cannot recall the exact page 32, line 10, strike out an amendment. We can expect that flow of gold to go? How far can it go? Will the beginning to demand gold in payment for their bills of exchange, and so forth. We can expect that flow of gold to continue out.

Mr. HINSHAW. What right have they got to it when Americans cannot have it? That is what I would like to know. I suggest that the appropriate committees of the Congress find out what is going on. If it is all right, that is satisfactory with me, I, then, have no criticism to make here, but I would like to know where it is going and why, The Clerk read as follows:

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, an amount to be charged against and to be used in the carrying out of the surplus personal property disposal program for educational purposes and protection of public health, education, and general welfare. Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 32, line 10, strike out "$80,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$80,000; the agency to be discontinued on and after July 1, 1952.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY).

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I disagree to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. NORRELL), but I do not believe his figures are correct. It is true that this surplus property disposal unit was set up to dispose of surplus property including that from the last war. He said we did not cut them any a year ago. We cut them from $358,000 to $353,000 a year ago. This year we cut them 10 percent, and that is not a very big reduction in a small unit like this, and we allow $300,000 to run this unit for the next fiscal year. In times of war we expect to collect over $350,000 in inspection revenue, which is turned into the Treasury. In other words they will show a profit for the Federal Treasury of $50,000 or more because their appropriation is less than the income. If you eliminate this program today you are going to hit every institution in every State of the Union that gets the advantage of the surplus. We have all objects to this property from these defense and other Federal sources, both personal and real estate, and this organization has done it. They have also given assistance to health units throughout the country. In the past 5 years about $1,200,000,000 has been transferred to educational and public health institutions. Property which came from the Federal appropriated $85,000,000,000 disposed of in the past 7 or 8 months by this particular organization, and if it had not been for this organization, may I say to the committee, I would cost the Federal Government huge sums to build or acquire the facilities that they have recaptured through the re-capture clause that they have in every transfer contract that they let in every community throughout the country. This is operating under the emergency program we are in at the present time. The committee recommended a 10 percent cut. In view of the facts before us, if you are going to cut this you are perhaps going to hit every county in Arkansas. There is probably not a county in Arkansas that has not benefited by this particular program. I think Arkansas alone has received at least $29,444,000 worth of surplus property at no cost to them at all, and all the education and health institutions in the country have received help from this particular program, and they are still receiving help. There was some freeze put on this matter last fall of $10,000 but it now again is flowing into the local educational institutions and public health centers all over the country at no cost to them. If it had been put on the market like these things that the Bonner
Committee is turning up, it would have caused a furor such as you probably never before heard. But, this has been one of the best run programs. It has been beneficial to the Federal Government; it has been beneficial to every community in this country that has taken advantage of it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I said the Bureau had done a good job, but I also said I thought the work had been done. I read the gentleman's report and I read the questions asked by the gentleman from Rhode Island as well as those asked by the gentleman from West Virginia. The report shows that the job has been done. If my amendment is adopted, they will have this year's money to operate on until July 1. My amendment would not take away the money, but simply take two-thirds of the money away from them and look forward, maybe, to winding up the business another year.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think if we want to lay the cards on the table, the gentleman's amendment should be to wipe out the entire agency as of July 1, because there is no need of giving them one-third of what they need to operate with. They cannot operate efficiently, and it will be a cost to the Federal Government and a cost to every taxpayer if you go through with this type of proposition. They just cannot operate efficiently on $100,000.

Let us lay the cards on the table. If you do not want this agency to exist any longer, if you do not think there is need for it, if you do not think the educational people in every State of the Union are for it, you have another think coming. Let us lay the cards on the table. Let us either take it all out or give them enough to operate on efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. NORRELL).

The question was taken; and on a division urged by Mr. Gathings there were—aye 104, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday when I spoke briefly with reference to the matter of vocational education and distributive occupations I did not have before me a very valuable report from the department of education of my native State of California, dated June 30, 1950. That booklet has been placed in my hands in the last hour, and I feel the House ought to have some of the important figures therein contained. I am sure the CONGRESSIONAL Record should contain them. I realize we have never seen that place in the bill where an amendment is possible, but I am sure you would want this valuable information, and that it will help correct misapprehensions previously. I am also sure that the Committee of the Whole had had this information earlier in the day it might well have favorably considered an amendment incorporating this sub-

ject of distributive education with modifications to some items which might be stricken. This report which I have is signed by Roy Simpson, superintendent of public construction of the State of California. It shows that in the State of California, and I take it in most States, this program which is being now eliminated under the terms of this bill as it now stands was initiated in 1937 in 31 communities in California, and then had 5,306 part-time classes, and, from 1937 until this date, 1950, the number of communities participating in this grant program, in which the States bore half and the Federal Government half, has increased to 129 cities. The number of students in this program, just in one State alone, in California, is over 60,000, as of June 1950.

The State of California Legislature the other day passed a resolution against deleting this amount in this bill, I am just informed.

Another important item of information which we should have in this Committee is that in 1937, when the program was first instituted in California, the classes were held in June, in the State of California alone, there were 1,123 classes, and there were part-time instructors numbering 469.

On yesterday I called your attention to the fact that two important telegrams were received by me. I wish to reemphasize those telegrams and call your attention to the one sent to me by Mr. Hollingsworth, the vocational department of our Long Beach city schools, which contains this language:

San Luis Obispo, Calif., April 18, 1951.

Congressman Clyde Doyle,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations:

Just learned that $10,000,000 was restored to the budget bill for vocational education, but $1,500,000 was deducted for the purpose of abolishing distributive educational program. Understand appropriation bill will be heard on the floor of the House of Representatives Tuesday. By abolishing this valuable program at this time it will deprive 129 school districts and 60,000 students of the benefit of the vocational education program. Hope you can do something on behalf of this fine program.

Julian A. McPhee,

President, California State Polytechnic College.

Long Beach, Calif., April 18, 1951.

Hon. Clyde Doyle,

Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington:

Knowing your interest in education following is sent as a guide. Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill to be voted upon Tuesday April 17. Bill omits inclusion of trade and distributive education. Douglas Newcomb, school superintendent, Long Beach Schools Executive Committee of Associated urges reinstatement of distributive education as training field continued through past world war much needed. Losing experienced salesmen to war plants. Decreased efficiency increases cost prices and damages public morale. Trained replacements needed. Federal money matched by State.

J. E. Hollingsworth.

The minute I saw that telegram, with the Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated of the city of Long Beach referred to, I realized that they speak for heavy taxpayers in my city and State. I also knew full well, because I know many of those executives, that when that telegram came to me and my colleagues, that they would not ask me to support any program which was not recognized by them, being heavy taxpayers, as a very, very valuable program. The telegram included approval from every executive here, and they would not ask me to support any program. The amendment included approval from every executive here, and they would not ask me to support any program which was not recognized by them, being heavy taxpayers, as a very, very valuable program. The amendment included approval from every executive here, and they would not ask me to support any program.

I have here a letter from the department of education, commission for vocational education of the State of California. I had the pleasure of serving as the State board of education of the State of California for a couple of years and at that time, in some small way at least, the value of this distributive education in my State came to my personal attention and just now Mr. Smith, the State director of vocational education, has communicated to me, and he says in his letter, just arrived:

San Luis Obispo, Calif., April 17, 1951.

The Honorable Clyde Doyle,

Chairman, House Appropriations Committee:

The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Doyle: We have just learned that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended $18,523,261 for the George-Barden Vocational Education Fund. This amount reflects a 100-percentage elimination of financial assistance for distributive education. The amounts for trade and industrial education, agricultural, and homemaking aspects of the total vocational education program have been restored.

This letter has as its purpose to protest this highly discriminatory action. To single out distributive education for complete elimination just doesn't make sense, especially in these days when the total manpower, not merely the production phases only, must be at the highest possible point of efficiency.

In California we are serving 129 communities this year in a program which has been a vital and integral part of our public-school system for almost 15 years.

While we all recognize the utmost importance of eliminating all expenditures, elimination of the $1,500,000 involved in this national program seems to me completely false economy. It is especially true when the result would be to deprive one segment of our working population of its right to learn, to enter, and to advance in an occupation.

The legislature of this State has adopted a resolution protesting such action. The public schools and the entire distributive phase of our economy appeal to you and your California colleagues to prevent such savings.

We wish there was more time in order to make you completely aware of the importance of this matter. The report was made public by the Appropriations Committee on Friday, April 13, and we understand they may take action on the matter on Tuesday, April 17.

We will appreciate any assistance you may see fit to render in securing restoration of the funds for distributive education.

Wesley F. Smith,

State Director of Vocational Education.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote from the final report of the California State Board of education for vocational education a few statements and figures. It may be that some of the items which the distinguished subcommittee
recommended should be eliminated during these days when we must only pay for the most essential. But gentlemen, that is no justification for so suddenly sacrificing all the program.

From the said report, I read:

PREFACE

The past year in distributive education in California included among its many achievements substantial increase in enrollments, communities served, classes offered, and the number of business specialists who served as instructors. The report of the program is presented in this bulletin of the Bureau of Business Education. It provides a splendid example of what can be accomplished when educational conditions and needs of business in the days that lie ahead.

ROY E. SIMPSON, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Executive Officer, State Board for Vocational Education.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

The present appears to be a period of adjustment—and it is a little too early to foresee the extent of the shift to military activities, particularly as it creates shortages of workers in business occupations. Judging from the previous war situation, employees of distributive organizations will be drawn into war employment. In many instances their jobs may be covered by the remaining force. In other cases, new personnel will be required.

A major factor in this problem and one not possible to forecast accurately is whether large-scale war is imminent. It may be that we are faced with a prolonged period of tension without large-scale war.

RETAILERS COOPERATE

An important development of recent days is the organization of the retailers of the United States as a first line of defense against inflationary pressures inherent in the national rearmament program. Representatives of every branch of the retail industry, meeting in Washington, D.C., formed a special retail industry committee to cooperate with the Federal Government in planning for future regulations and problems.

The objectives of the committee include the following: "American retailers are united in their awareness of the inflation hazard of the present emergency. We have pledged our opposition to any force which might accelerate the upward price spiral. It is a further objective of the retail industry committee to establish a liaison relationship with Government so that the retail industry may effectively plan a constructive part in national planning for whatever emergency may occur."

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

The flexibility and resourcefulness of distributive education are certain to be called upon increasingly as the change from peacetime to a wartime economy develops. There will be new opportunities for placement workers in all fields of distributive activity; for supervisory training courses; for instructors and guidance in helping businessmen in business operation during controls and shortages. These are all essential to every program including food handling and sanitation, salesmanship and customer relations training, and others; to list only a few responsibilities.

Cooperative classes will be an increasingly important means of helping businessmen meet the needs for wartime personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>EVENING AND PART-TIME</th>
<th>COOPERATIVE AND PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21,792</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22,284</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37,078</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38,147</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39,259</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude for the fine work accomplished by the Senate Crime Committee headed by my colleague, Senator ESTES Kefauver. The evidence unearthed by the committee reveals the existence of organized interstate crime conditions in excess of anything we had imagined. There is certainly ample evidence of the need for appropriate Federal legislation in this field, and the need for new legislation to stop the organized activities of these gangsters.

In my opinion, if we are to gain the fruits of the work done by Senator Kefauver and his committee, we should establish a joint House-Senate watchdog committee. The watchdog committee would have two principal functions: First, to keep a careful check on the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of enforcement of Federal laws. Secondly, the watchdog committee could investigate from time to time serious crime activities over which the Federal Government would have jurisdiction.

To work in conjunction with the watchdog committee an independent crime commission should be established, made up of outstanding business men. The crime commission could work with various State and local crime committees in order to maintain a continuing surveillance of large scale criminal activities.

In the past, much of the great good accomplished by special investigative committees of both the House and Senate has been lost by the failure of Congress to follow through on the original investigations. The establishment of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee will give assurance to the country that the Congress will not repeat the tragic errors made in the past. It will benotice to the underworld that this is not just another investigation, but the beginning of a real and sustained effort by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States to eliminate organized gangsterism and organized criminal syndicates in the United States. My early experience as State prosecutor taught me that it takes more than half-way measures to eliminate crime.

A joint committee will be more effective than a single committee, because the House of Representatives has original jurisdiction in many of the problems relating to crime. The Joint committees dealing with tax problems must originate in the House of Representatives under the Constitution. This is likewise true of other questions that arise in connection with violation of Federal law.

It is my intention to join with Senator Kefauver in supporting the establishment of a joint watchdog committee. Having followed the work of Chairman Kefauver's committee and the recommendations that he has made, I know that the suggestions I have made are in accordance with his views.

I will within a few days introduce in the House a concurrent resolution to provide for an effective Senate-House watchdog committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Louisiana. I yield to my able colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman has made a wonderful statement. I would like to commend him on it. I hope the House will follow through on his splendid suggestion. I would like to tell the gentleman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been working on one of the subsidiary problems that the gentleman mentioned; namely, the narcotics trade in the United States. We have discovered far-reaching implications in this trade.

I am also happy to tell the gentleman that we have recommended legislation, which will soon be reported to this body for action. I commend the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the efforts that he has made and the leadership he has provided in his committee to bring out the necessary legislation. He has hit on something very important, and that is the necessity for a joint committee of the House and Senate, because in many cases the House has recommended legislation relating to criminal activities. In other words, the whole question of tax viola-
tion is a matter of original jurisdiction in the House, and that is why we need a joint committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield further, there is also the question of overlapping jurisdiction on the part of different committees, and I think that would be one of the real achievements of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to commend the gentleman on his very fine statement. I would like to call attention to the fact that 3 or 4 years ago we organized a crime commission in California, and Governor Warren appointed Admiral Jonathan M. Stone to head of it. He pointed out in his report that crime was interstate and that you could not define it to any one territory; that you must have some interstate legislation in order to reach the underworld effectively. I think the scheme you have proposed will do that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I think the evidence unearched by the Kefauver committee has proved beyond doubt the existence of an interstate crime syndicate on a scale that most of us had not imagined at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from California on the interstate interest in the problem that the gentleman has presented to the House. As one member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to advise you that our committee has been interested in the problem which the gentleman mentioned, and would like to recall to the gentleman's mind the report of the committee which did report out a bill on the slot-machine syndicate only in the last Congress.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct, and that simply confirms the need for joint House and Senate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of saying that we are reaching the end of the bill. We have three more titles to read. I understand there are two or three more amendments to be offered. I am sure that if we confine our remarks to the pending bill, it would expedite consideration of the remaining sections and we will make much better time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Title III—National Labor Relations Board

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

On page 112, strike out "$8,300,000" and insert "$8,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of Virginia: On page 112, strike out "$8,300,000" and insert "$8,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed in order to cut the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board from the figure set forth in the bill of $8,300,000 to $8,000,000, resulting in a saving of $300,000.

The justification for this is as follows: If you will look at the schedule in back of the bill it appears there that the Labor Board has been cut from its last year's appropriation, but if you will look on
to do it with, and I protest again, but by the executive department to settle. Labor disputes when we had a labor act which was set up by the Congress, is going to be diminished.

Now, I do not want to get off the track. What I am trying to do is to save the taxpayers of the United States $800,000 of unnecessary expenditures. I am asking the House to vote to sustain this amendment and cut that appropriation back to the point of what may be needed.

Mr. Halleck. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Smith of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Halleck. I think the gentleman's argument is well taken on the basis of his assumption. However, I suggest in respect to his references to the responsibility of the Congress, that possibly the Congress ought to look into the matter that is presently developing and see just what the Congress can do to alleviate this strain.

Mr. Smith of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana knows that he will have no more ardent advocate of that program than the present speaker now addressing you. I shall be glad to join with the gentleman.

Mr. Fogarty. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereeto close in 5 minutes.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Chairman. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty].

Mr. Fogarty. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted during the Eightieth Congress under Republican control. That is one of the things that they take credit for during their regime when they had control of both the House and the Senate. On a personal basis I bitterly opposed the passage of that act. I am still opposed to it, and I remember very well when the act was passed and when the first request for appropriations came before this subcommittee some 3 or 4 years ago. They did not have anything to justify their appropriation at all under the new act, but we gave them every dime they asked for. I remember the argument used then was "this is our baby and we have to give them every dime they ask for because we do not want to be blamed for this act if we do not give them enough to operate with." I went along with the majority at that time, who were Republicans, and because of wanting to be fair in the entire proceeding I have never willfully, in one way or another, attempted to cut this appropriation just because I was against the enactment of this law.

As a consequence, for the past 3 years since I have been a chairman of this subcommittee we have not purposely cut it one dime just because some of us had been opposed to and voted against giving this act when it was passed 4 years ago. On the contrary we have gone along with them. They came before us and they gave us the workloads they are working under; they gave us the backlog of the number of cases they are behind, and they established such a case that we have practically given them every dime they have asked for in order to carry out the provisions of that act. They testified this year in 1951 the estimated cases to be processed were 22,850. In 1952 they show an increase up to 23,600. On the record of case intake for the fiscal year 1951 and 1952 it is 22,850. So, all the figures that they have given us show that their increase in workload is going up year after year, and that is why we did not cut them as much as we did the other agencies, although we did cut them $282,500 this year to bring them in line so that they could operate on the fiscal year 1951 basis. I just wanted to make this one thing clear to you. It is that since this subcommittee has been against that act since it was enacted, we have never deliberately attempted to slice one dollar from that, or could it never be blamed, I think it is on the books of Congress. It was put on by a majority vote of the Eightieth Congress, and they should have the money to operate with, and we have been fair with them in their appropriation.

Mr. Nelson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Fogarty. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. Nelson. Can the gentleman tell me where this new board created by Executive order will get its money to operate?

Mr. Fogarty. I cannot tell the gentleman that. We have nothing to do with it. It is not in this bill. There is nothing in this bill that pertains to that board at all. We have absolutely nothing to do with it. It is under some defense appropriations subcommittee in the House, I would assume.

Mr. Holifield. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Fogarty. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Holifield. Would this War Labor Board that has been created handle the rank-and-file cases of the type that are now before the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. Fogarty. That is something I do not know. This new Board has just been established. I do not know what its duties are. I do not know whether they are going to get money to function with or not. I do not know whether they are going to need money. I do not know whether they are going to be paid or not. That is something I do not know, and I do not think the Congress knows. It has not been before our committee, and I do not believe it has been before any other committee on appropriations, to my knowledge; so I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. Holifield. So cutting the appropriation then would be just taking a shot in the dark and hoping there would be an agency now set up that would take over the work that is being done by the National Labor Relations Board?
Mr. FOOGARTY. I cannot give the gentleman an answer to that at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division of the question, by Mr. COX there were—ayes 116, noes 60.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Flood payment to railroad retirement account:

For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228–228b), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1538); Provided, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury in view of the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. CROSSER. The point of order goes to the entire paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago if his point of order was to the proviso only and I understand the gentleman to say that it was.

Mr. FLOOD. That was true. That was the point of order I made, but I have no objection to making a subsequent point of order this time to make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, so there may be no misunderstanding about the situation, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York concede the point of order to the entire paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, where does the point of order now end? Does it end on line 16? I am confused. I do not know where the language ends to which the point of order is made. Does it end on page 36 or does it end on line 24 of page 36?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order now takes in the entire paragraph beginning on page 36 and ending at line 16, page 36, as follows:

Payment to railroad retirement account:

For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228–228b), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1927, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding $4,500,000 appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by Mr. McGrath: On page 36, line 14, insert the following:

"Payment to railroad retirement account:

For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228–228b), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1538) and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1927, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding $4,500,000 appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951."

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, reducing this proposed amendment to its simplest terms, it is simply a method by which we hope to save $4,500,000 of the taxpayers' money. Heretofore the procedure had been that at the beginning of the fiscal year they would approximate the amount which would be collected in taxes and then appropriate that amount. The new language provides that the taxes, as they are collected, will be turned over from the Treasury to the Railroad Retirement Board for immediate investment and for the payment of necessary benefits. The present system has been somewhat of a guess; a sort of put-and-take proposition, as we have in our social-security program. The purpose of this would be to save the taxpayers the interest on the amount, and to set this up on a sound basis, and it means a saving of $4,500,000.
Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. The fact is you are changing the law as it now exists in that respect.

Mr. McGRATH. No. I will say to the gentleman that is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Crosses offers the following amendment in substitution for the amendment offered by Mr. McGar, line 15 on page 36:

"Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1936, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter act, $255,354,455: Provided, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. Chairman. I raise the point of order against this substitute amendment that this places additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and I respectfully call the attention of the chairman to the language of the proposed amendment that the current payment shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Crosses] desire to be heard?

Mr. CROSSER. I simply deny the fact. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio cite the law giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority referred to?

The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Crosses] seems to place additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury not contemplated by law and therefore the point of order?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman. I take this time to try to understand, if I can, the language offered by the gentleman from New York on behalf of the committee, and just what it would do. I want to know if this is not in fact the same as the other amendment just deleted by point of order.

Mr. McGRATH. With the accent on the "annual basis."

Mr. HARRIS. Now, I understand the language was subject to a point of order and stricken out. Then the gentleman offered a substitute and a substitute. I have not had an opportunity to read it.

I would like to ask if the gentleman's amendment he has offered as a substitute does not mean that the committee language would have done. I would like to understand what. I may be in accord with what the gentleman offers, but I am not sure that I understand what he wants to do.

Mr. McGRATH. We do not go beyond the fiscal year of 1952.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand, then, that the gentleman or his committee has had information from the Treasury Department that after this fiscal year, under the administration of this program they intend to carry out the policy as the committee has outlined in its report?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; I would say that the answer to the gentleman's question is yes. The committee has been advised by the Budget Bureau that an arrangement has been worked out with the Treasury to put into effect a new system of tax collections. Beginning with the fiscal year 1952 they will collect taxes monthly instead of quarterly and pay those funds over to the trust fund on a monthly basis. In that way the fund will have the money available for investment and interest-earning purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I personally would not have any objection to a program under a plan deemed most advisable. I am sure the gentleman understands that in the course of the passage by this Congress of the Railroad Retirement Act that was discussed. The first act went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Out of that experience the act of 1937 was passed.

I want to understand clearly that any action taken by this committee here today would not affect the decision of the Supreme Court and the plan which provided and which is authorized by that act. Can the gentleman give us that assurance?

Mr. McGRATH. I can say to you absolutely I give you that assurance.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it appears after further consideration that the language in this substitute might in some way seriously affect this program the gentleman assure us that in the course of the progress of this legislation, or in conference the committee will accept and assent on such qualification as is found advisable and necessary?

Mr. McGRATH. I can assure the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, for I consider him one of the most able Members of this House, that we will consult him in an effort to work it out.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from New York. He understands as I do that this places additional duties upon the Bureau that an arrangement has been made by that act. Can the gentleman give us that assurance?

Mr. McGRATH. I can say to you absolutely I give you that assurance.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it appears after further consideration that the language in this substitute might in some way seriously affect this program the gentleman assure us that in the course of the progress of this legislation, or in conference the committee will accept and assent on such qualification as is found advisable and necessary?

Mr. McGRATH. I can assure the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, for I consider him one of the most able Members of this House, that we will consult him in an effort to work it out.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from New York. He understands as I do that this is a highly important matter and very, very technical. You cannot change the language of this law without affecting the purposes and intentions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield; and I would like to say in yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey that he was here and on the committee at the time this legislation was passed and is one Member of this House who knows as much about it as anyone else.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I hardly wish to qualify to that extent. But it is my opinion that this particular substitute that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Crosses] is in entire accord with the Retirement Act, and that the wording of the closing sentence of his amendment, reading as follows: "shall be invested by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937," does not change or add to the duties of the Secretary under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and is consequently in order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey that the Chair has already sustained the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. Crosses].

What I was trying to do was to clarify the intentions and understand the language presented by the committee here in reference to this matter. I certainly do not think it should be cut out entirely, but I think we should clearly understand just what the language the gentleman proposes will do.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am of the opinion that it will do what was originally intended by the committee when it put the provision in the original bill and against which the point of order was raised and sustained. In order that there may be a complete understanding of this matter, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee that the appropriation language in the bill, H. R. 3709, beginning in line 15 on page 35 of the bill and continuing through line 16 on page 36, makes a substantial change in the provisions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act which authorizes appropriations to the railroad retirement account. This section reads as follows:

Sec. 15. (a) There is hereby created an account in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the railroad retirement account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, as an annual premium, an amount sufficient, with a reasonable margin for contingencies, to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and annually thereafter, an amount equal to 3 percent of the payroll covered into the account in the preceding fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, as an annual premium.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from New York. He understands as I do that this is a highly important matter and very, very technical. You cannot change the language of this law without affecting the purposes and intentions of the Railroad Retirement Act.
There is nothing in this section which makes appropriations to the railroad retirement account conditioned upon amounts collected in taxes for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system nor which authorizes in effect a series of monthly appropriations determined by the monthly collections. On the contrary, it authorizes only a single annual appropriation in a definite amount to be determined in accordance with the authorization.

By way of comparison, I direct your attention to section 10 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which reads in pertinent part as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance account. This account shall consist of (1) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as is in excess of the total compensation on which such contributions are based, together with all interest collected pursuant to section 8 (g) of this act.

The appropriation language in that act makes it clear, except for the portion to be deposited in an administration fund, all the contributions collected for the maintenance of the unemployment insurance system shall be deposited in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The difference between the appropriation language in the two acts leaves no room for doubt that Congress very deliberately authorized different methods of appropriation for the two systems. No one could say reasonably that the appropriation language in the two acts is even similar—that the appropriation language in section 16 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act could be substituted for the appropriation language in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act. Yet the substance, is what the bill H. R. 3979 proposes to do. Thus, the language in the bill would make the amount appropriated to the railroad retirement account and the time the appropriation becomes effective conditioned upon the amount and timing of collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act similar to the provision in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The language in the bill, though it gives lip service to the words "annual premium," makes no reference to section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act, which is the authority for the appropriation to the railroad retirement account.

That Congress provided different methods of making appropriations under the two acts may be further seen from section 18 of that: Railroad Retirement Act, which provides as follows:

SEC. 18. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to provide for the expenses of the Board in administering the provisions of this act and the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935.

And from section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act which provides in pertinent part as follows:

SEC. 11. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This fund shall consist of (1) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as equals 0.3 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based.

The failure of any reference in section 16 of the Railroad Retirement Act to taxes collected for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system, and the specific reference to contributions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act is further proof of congressional intent to distinguish between the methods of appropriation for the two acts.

In practice the amounts appropriated to the railroad retirement account are so adjusted from year to year as to result in appropriations of no more than is actually collected in taxes. But the method of appropriation established in section 15 (a) of the Retirement Act was deliberately adopted for an important purpose. When it was enacted it was considered that the constitutional basis of the legislation that this method be followed. If the validity of that consideration is now to be questioned and a different authorization for appropriations proposed, such a step cannot properly be considered here until the legislative committee responsible for railroad retirement legislation gives the matter its consideration.

The question here is solely whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can take upon itself the authority to override and change the method established by Congress for making appropriations to the railroad retirement account; whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can override the practice followed for the past 9 years by appropriation committees, including this very Appropriations Committee, in making appropriations to the railroads retirement account in accordance with the provisions of section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act.

We cannot properly here debate the wisdom or the propriety of the present provision in the Railroad Retirement Act with regard to appropriations to the railroad retirement account. I am only arguing for a proper and orderly procedure in this respect. If the Appropriations Committee is convinced that the method in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act should be changed, the proper form for a discussion of this question is the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which was responsible for the enactment of the original provision in 1937 and before which all persons having an interest in the issue can be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I have some very serious suspicions on it myself. We should not legislate on these things in a technical manner; and if any changes are made in the basic law it should be after full hearings by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I have the honor to serve and which has legislative jurisdiction of this subject. It affects several thousand railroad employees. It means too much to them and the industry to adopt basic changes in the law without knowing the effects.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ays 119, noes 5.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Relations Panel as provided in section 208 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations matters, at rates not in excess of $3,047,000; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services authorized by the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $3,047,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas. On page 37, line 14, strike out "$3,047,000" and insert "$2,949,700."

Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am submitting applies to one agency only. If approved, it will reduce the appropriation by $77,300. It will mean the agency will still have the same amount it had last year. This agency did ask for still more money, but the committee granted the increase indicated in the bill. Now, take a brief look at this agency, comparatively small in size, asked for $3,247,000 for salaries and expenses for 494 people, some of them only part-time employees. That is $6,530 for all employees, an average of $8,000 per year. This is counting stenographers, clerks, and others at comparatively lower salaries. This would indicate some of them are doing pretty well in the way of salaries. I remind you the request indicates is for part-time assistance. This part-time assistance is to be paid on the basis of $75 per day and expenses. The agency is allowed to go out and employ whom it chooses and pay as much as $75 per day without consideration of civil-service requirements.

Neither the bill nor the report nor the hearings indicate how much of this fund of more than $3,000,000 is to be spent on the $75-a-day employees. Nothing is said about the tier for full-time employees. The bill says, in substance, you propose to spend more than $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses of officers, employees, temporary employees that include arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations matters. The hearings indicate the employment of approximately 400 people. There is an additional item of $50,000 for temporary employees in Colombia. Incidentally, it may be said this expenditure is in support of labor.
Whether that be correct or not, I cannot imagine the rank and file of labor wanting to increase an item that will pay any agency employees an average of more than $8,000 per year, many of them working only part time. Nor for paying a lot of additional persons I have described more than $50 per day and expenses service.

My amendment is a mild one. It just says the agency cannot expend more than last year. But, if you approve it, there will be reductions of $97,000 to taxpay of this country. Even then you are still being pretty liberal with this agency.

This amendment should be approved.

Following action on the pending amendment, if I may have the attention of the Chair, I shall offer a further amendment which will reduce the maximum of $75 a day proposed in this bill to back to $50 a day.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the fine manner in which the leader of this agency has been admin­istered by its present Administrator, Mr. Ching. From what I have heard concerning Mr. Ching, he is one of the most industrious and able men at the head of any of our agencies. He is high in the esteem of those who know him personally. I do think, however, that if permitted to select men for these higher paid positions—without present or influence of any kind—he can do a still better job. If he were allowed to select all of these appointees without political influence of any kind, it would be helpful to his agency as well to us as to the agency itself.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to cripple the functions of any needed service. But here is a place where an agency, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and the mounting cost of government ought to be willing to cut any unnecessary expenses, work just a little harder and save a little more money for needed expenditures for the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat a statement I have made on the floor of this House I have made many times before. I regard this as one of the most important things that has appeared before it. He has asked for an increase this year of $200,000. The committee cut that increase asked for by $200,000, thinking that much was all that could be imposed. We placed in the record how many em­ployees he had in 1946, 1950, 1951, and 1952. In 1946 they had 488 employees; in 1950, 351; in 1951, 564. He asked for 406 employees, but with the money we allowed in the committee bill they will probably have over 375, employees, which is 113 less than they had in 1946. We think he has been doing a good job with the personnel he has had, but I think we must remember that the per­sonnel he has working under him should be re­membered by everyone, that in times of an emergency there is always a great demand by the public to avoid strikes and maintain production. A principal purpose of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is to prevent strikes, and they have prevented many times more strikes than have occurred in the year or 2 years because of the leader­ship of Cyrus Ching and the type of personnel he has working under him. We think he is one of the ablest ad­ministrators we have in any Federal agency. His experi­ence in the last war when more men were needed in order to prevent strikes before they occur, we allowed him a small increase this year. We want to write into the record that he could prevent strikes that might otherwise take place in the next fiscal year. Now, that is the kind of a record he has and that is the record that he is living up to. I record that he is known by. I do not believe there is a Member of the Congress that will dis­pute the statement that I have just made.

Mr. Chairman, since the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been headed by Cyrus Ching, who I believe has the respect of most of the members of this Congress, which states:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rees of Kansas on page 37, line 11, insert "$50" and insert in lieu thereof "$50."
There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Winp). Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I anticipated the appropriation bill came up in which the agencies of labor are quite considerably involved, that again the labor movement would be the whipped boys. I am inclined to an indication to me which I simply could not let pass without presenting to the House some of the involvement. So far as Mr. Ching is concerned, I am not always in agreement with him, but I find him quite conservative. As a matter of fact he is a little too conservative so far as people are concerned for whom he has tried to mediate fair and equitable agreements. But this is what has happened in this field. During the Eighteenth Congress in my city where the Conciliation and Mediation agency is located, you have the testimony of Mr. James T. Carlgren in Minneapolis, and among those who are most respected in our agencies, but it seems to me a little far when you bring in an appropriation bill and say that we are going to pay a group of people, I do not know how many, $75 per day and put no limitation in this bill. It does not say how many you are going to hire at $75 a day or $60 a day or $50 a day; not at all. You open the gate and we will have legislation asking that the amount be fixed at $100 per day. Again I call attention there are no qualifications in the bill. Not at all. A little while ago, there is not even anything in the testimony submitted in the hearings to say what these qualifications may be.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service approved legislation permitting the President to break the ceiling on Federal salaries, the number of persons in each category and salary allowed in the legislation. Has any member of the committee computed the amount an employee would draw at $75 per day if he worked for a year? He worked a week, take 2 days off, and make $10,750 and his expenses. Mr. Chairman, this committee, and the membership of this House, would if they knew the amounts expended, be interested in the cost of the services of engineers hired on a contract basis in advisory capacity to some of our agencies. I am not right here criticizing the service, but the amount expended runs in rather high figures. Again I want to pay my high regard and respect to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Crawford). He has made a good presentation of this legislation to the committee. He has been eminently fair, even though we may disagree. I hope the committee will support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?
and reconciling these particular disputes on a nation-wide basis.

During the hearings I said, "This year people get $75." Mr. Ching said, "Yes."

We had some language in the bill for 1951 to pay the men $75 a day, but up until the time this hearing was held not one dime was spent for this particular kind of arbitration. It is put in the bill for a purpose. When he gets into a stalemate on a Nation-wide basis, when he has to take men away from business or a man sitting on the supreme court in some state has had experience in settling these particular disputes, that is the man he reaches for and gets, because he is the most competent man, in his opinion, to handle and settle that dispute. That is the only reason we have it in there, not because of anything the committee wants to do, but because of the evidence that was presented to us which was the thing to do. It is merely standby authority to be used only when it is really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in propaganda or publicity purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 90, after line 7, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or proposals purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent as far as possible the spending of unreasonable amounts for propaganda and publicity purposes. It is in no way affects the amount as authorized in this bill. The two agencies affected are the Labor and Federal Security.

We know that as far as Mr. Ewing is concerned he is constantly propagandaizing the country on socialized medicine. A look at an analysis or a breakdown of the schedule shows that for Labor, item No. 4, Printing and reproduction, we have the amount of $522,151. Just what that covers I have not been able to discover, at least members of the committee on our side of the aisle have not been able to learn specifically what is covered.

Under social security we give to Mr. Ewing the grand sum of $2,165,815 for printing and reproduction. We have some idea, I believe, what some of this money will go for. I want to call attention to the testimony that was developed in the committee on the activities of Mr. Ewing, and at this point I would like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fogarty), that I believe he and his subcommittee have been tough on the social-security agency, they have done a fine job but I think we can be still more tough on Mr. Ewing. I would like to read a colloquy between the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Hendrick), of the committee, and Mr. Ewing from page 346 of the hearings for the Federal Security Agency:

Mr. Hendrick. Mr. Ewing, you stated a few minutes ago that you made a good many speeches and had requests to make lots of speeches.

Mr. Ewing. Yes.

Mr. Hendrick. I would like to inquire how many speeches you made during the calendar year 1949?

Mr. Ewing. I would have to check that.

Mr. Hendrick. Has Mr. Ewing been afraid to guess. I think I furnished the figures for 1949 to the Buchanan committee, but I have never made it up for this.

Mr. Hendrick. What about 1949?

Mr. Ewing. I believe it is here. However, I do not think they break it down as to subject matter. I have that broken down someplace.

This information was apparently submitted later:

A total of 18 speeches dealing in whole or in part with children insurance programs were delivered during the calendar year 1949 by the Federal Security Administrator, or one of his immediate assistants, including a speaking engagement which he was unable to fill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's statement by saying that in the educational field much propaganda has come out of that office advertising the transition from a national government to one of a state government. I know that because the superintendent of public instruction in my State received part of this material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment in using the word "propaganda" jeopardize the entire program of the National Security Agency and should not the gentleman's amendment more properly be addressed to propaganda concerning the health-insurance program?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I could not agree with the gentleman. It seems to me that we can well distinguish between what is propaganda and what is educational matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a very marked distinction. The gentleman's amendment runs only to matters which have not had the support of the approval of the Congress. The matter of getting out pamphlets has always had the approval of Congress through action of the committee on which the gentleman serves.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In the gentleman's opening statement he made reference to two agencies that were getting out considerable printed matter and propaganda. Let us get back to the Labor Department. Has the gentleman at any time witnessed any material coming out of the Labor Department which he would term propaganda?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think that is obvious. Mr. WIER. Let us talk about propaganda now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is propaganda.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. While we are talking about Oscar Ewing, I asked for a breakdown from Mr. Ewing when we had the hearings on the travel expenses of not
only himself but the other members of his administrative staff, which I shall include in the record.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by merely pointing out that this is a prohibition which affects those agencies that have not already been set up and their present programs. It goes, however, prohibits the extension of propaganda and publicity activities in any future appropriation bills to attempt to have inserted this same provision because I believe that the American people are fed up with political and propaganda handouts from the Federal Government. This is an abuse that strikes directly at our free institutions. The time to stop the practice is now.

Mr. BUSHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know the membership of the committee will be interested to know some of the traveling expenses that have been incurred in the Federal Security Agency.

May I give this information to the committee at this time:

Mr. Ewing has spent a total of $3,260.73; Mr. Bernstein, $2,607.96; Anna Hedgeman, $3,384.15; Mary Switzer, $1,148; Theodore Hayes, $236.10; Jewell Swofford, $1,211.96; and Mr. Meader, $4,057.21, making a total of $12,758.48.

There are other totals to be added, such as administrative planning, budget division, personnel division, and service operations amounting to $4,465.98, and some other figures that went along with those amounts making $863.84, making a grand total of $19,088.20.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I hope that all future appropriation bills will contain the provision which is supposed to be in the basic law. We are to save the taxpayers money the one place we can do it is to place a limitation on the propaganda machine of the Federal Government. I have taken some figures of the publicity and propaganda activities of the Government. The latest that are available are 1946. But, the Budget Bureau shows that in 1946 the total expenditures in the Executive branch for publicity and propaganda amounted to $75,000,000. That probably was raised, from the information I have been able to get from the various departments, amounting to an increase in appropriations of something over $100,000,000 as of today.

Back in 1946 there were 45,000 Federal employees engaged in information and publicity and propaganda activities of the Federal Government where you could put your finger on them, but the greater bulk of the publicity and propaganda goes on within the executive departments of our Government is not conducted by those who are listed as information specialists but those who are doing their work under some other heading and going out to organize their influence on the Congress throughout the country. In 1946 it was $75,000,000; today it is probably $100,000,000, but just 10 years ago the figure for publicity and propaganda in the United States was $27,770,000; or, in other words, there has been an increase over the past 10 years of over three hundredfold in the amount, the taxpayers' money that is being used for this purpose.

Let me just call your attention to a few of the things that are done with taxpayers' money to bring that about. In this attempt to propagate socialized medicine, they set up teams to send throughout the country to organize local groups and then get those local groups to put the heat on the Congress. One of the bulletins and one of the pamphlets taken from the files of the Federal Security Agency to be used by their training officers set out to organize these meetings show the following: These are the topics that the training officers have to use in organizing these groups. First, they are to set up techniques for the organization of groups; the second thing is the formation of pressure groups and, third, methods of bringing about group action. The Federal employees were being paid to go out to organize groups and then get those local groups to put the heat on the Congress. One of these statements said that the Federal employees arranged the meetings; they invited the delegates; they trained the delegates, they presided at the meetings, and then framed a formal summary of resolution for action.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the one place we certainly can save the taxpayers' money is the adoption of this amendment and amendments similar to it in all future appropriation bills to cut out this illegal expenditure which amounts to something over $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to this member, 5 minutes to be reserved for the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Meader).

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Smith).

Mr. Chairman, I think this subject is one of greatest importance to the Congress. It deserves more attention than can be given in this fashion in the debate on an amendment to an appropriation bill. We are indebted to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) for the information he has presented here in this debate this afternoon, which he derived from his service as counsel for a committee investigating propaganda activities of the Federal Government.

There is far more than merely the amount of money involved in this particular principle. I have previously urged my belief that it is necessary to strengthen the Congress in the interest of formulating national policy by the people themselves. It is a corollary to that principle that public opinion ought not to be subjected to influence and direction by the executive agencies, the administrative branch of the Government, in the manner that it is today. In a democracy, where public opinion rules in the long run, the media of communication: the press, the radio, television, and the printed word, are very potent weapons in the control of the affairs of this country. We should not finance use of these agencies to foster and perpetuate the bureaucracies—not the people's objectives in national policy.

If $100,000,000 is being spent by the Federal agencies in the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of influencing opinion, I say that is a trend which is not wholesome and which people involved here in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I am not sure that simply prohibiting the use of funds for publicity and propaganda will be an adequate way to deal with this problem. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to what extent the subcommittee has been able to isolate activities of the Federal Government devoted to propaganda and publicity, and how many employees and how much expense is involved in those activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the benefit of the gentleman, I will say that 2 or 3 years ago Mr. Ewing was isolated from most of the publicity and propaganda that was being issued out of that office. When I got a look at the job they have done on his office today, when they cut out an additional $250,000, there is not going to be much left in there for any publicity worth while or for the next fiscal year. Where, in the guise of some of these things, they are taken care of.

Mr. MEADER. Does the committee have a staff which, the year around, examine into the propaganda and publicity activities of the agencies under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. At the request of the subcommittee, a staff can be arranged to investigate anything. We do not even know what the gentleman calls propaganda. We do not want what he calls the right type of publicity or the wrong type of publicity. That is the fault I find with this amendment.

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman that I should like to support any movement or any request he may make for additional funds to find out the details about these expenditures and to what extent the agencies which are supposed to carry out policy are attempting to influence policy. In my judgment, the policy of the country should be made here in the Congress and it should be carried out in the executive branch of the Government. It is wrong to have the executive branch of the Government spending the taxpayers' funds to influence public thinking and to create policy.
Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman. I also think it should be brought to our attention that the chairman has just referred to a gentleman who served as counsel for a committee back in 1947 and 1948. The chairman of that committee was before the committee which was then controlled by the Republicans, and Frank Keefe was chairman of the committee, making some of the charges that have been made this afternoon. They were proven false. There was not an iota of truth about that charge at all. That was under the leadership of the gentleman's own party.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell me of any one statement that was made on this floor by me this afternoon which was proven to be false in the Keefe committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say that. Mr. BOW. What is exactly the language that was used.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me get the gentleman straight on that. I am talking about the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Wisconsin appointed for. He appeared before our committee. There was not one iota of truth in the charges he made before our committee. There was not one iota of truth in the charges he made before that committee. That is what I said. I speak plain English, and I think the gentleman can hear me as well as anybody else can.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman say what was in the committee report I have read from today that was proven in the Keefe committee not to be true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not refer to the gentleman, I referred to the chairman that he worked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) to close debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get excited about this amendment, or at least I will try not to get excited, but I do think it is a poor business. Here you are limiting the amount of publicity and propaganda which may be issued by any agency of government in this bill and yet you do not define in the amendment what propaganda is or what publicity is. You have no idea at all of the number of publications that are issued or of the type of publications, or anything else. All you want to do is to cut it out and not a word is said about where the cut is to be made. The same thing has been done this afternoon on some other cuts. You do not seem to care where the cuts are or whom they are going to affect or how much harm they are going to do to that particular agency or to the defense of the country especially with reference to the cut which was made on the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service just a few moments ago.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman have any idea how much additional staff he would need for his subcommittee to distinguish between legitimate publications such as statistical reports and other official reports of that kind by executive agencies, and propaganda which is designed to influence public opinion? Can the gentleman tell me how much of a staff he would need and whether he has asked for it?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the proper way to get at the bottom of this entire thing is that the gentleman from Wisconsin speaking in support of this amendment and all the others who have spoken in favor of it should come up with some concrete evidence of what is being issued as propaganda now from the Department of Labor and from the Federal Security Agency. When you give us the proper evidence, then we will take steps. When you produce the proper evidence we will get a sufficient staff to make a thorough investigation. I make that as a promise now. You produce the evidence and give us some of these booklets and pamphlets that you claim are propaganda issued by particular agencies and we will take proper action.

The matter will not have to come before the Congress. The committee will do it. I will consult with the rest of the committee and see to it. I will cut out every dime in the appropriation if you give us any evidence of any pamphlet or booklet or propaganda, which is in a real sense propaganda. I will do along with the rest of the subcommittee and cut out every dime of it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The testimony of Oscar Ewing answers the gentleman's question. He has been propagandizing for compulsory health insurance. He admits it in his own testimony. Is that not propaganda?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about his travel.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No, I am not.

Mr. FOGARTY. It would have been an education for you, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, to have been with the subcommittee. I do not believe that any man has appeared before us who has been questioned more closely as to his activities and matters he advocates than has the Federal Security Administrator. It is not anything new. It has been going on since he has been Administrator.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, we know that and that is what we are trying to get at in this amendment. He made 18 speeches in 1950, according to his own testimony.

Mr. FOGARTY. That was in 1950. He is not going to do it in 1951, and I do not believe he is going to do it in 1952 because he knows how the committee feels about it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Rhode Island to yield in an effort to be helpful to him. Let me suggest that if he wants evidence as to the unnecessary publicity and propaganda being put out by this and other Government agencies, all he has to do when we close debate today and the Committee rises, and after the House adjourns, is to go over to his office and look in his own wastebasket.

Mr. FOGARTY. A lot of it is coming from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chambers of commerce and all the rest of them. That is where I am getting all the publicity and propaganda.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman throws away everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers.

I am sure he throws everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers into the wastebasket [Mr. SMITH] from the CIO.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not. I read them all, because I like to get both sides of the subject. I want to find out who is right and who is wrong, and then try to make up my own mind, and I wish everybody else would do the same.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. A great deal of it comes from the organization of Mr. Rumely, who was convicted today of contempt of court. The resolution to cite him for contempt only passed the House of Representatives by five or six votes. Most of the Republicans voted against authorizing the contempt proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. FOGARTY) has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—aye 144, noes 22.

Mr. McGrATIL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to act as tellers.

The Committee then divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 156, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 39, line 8, insert a new section, as follows: "(a) Part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(1) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(2) to positions filled from within the agency;

(3) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(4) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including technicians, in the Public Health Service, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, and Freedmen's Hospital;

(5) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2."
Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to permit the Labor-Department bill of 46,800 to fill 25 percent of the vacancies which occur in those agencies during the fiscal year 1952, with some exceptions, as you will note.

The report on this bill indicates budget reductions of some $80,973,799 on this bill. However it is not possible to definitely determine just how many people will have to be dropped as a result of this action. These cuts are substantial and the committee is to be congratulated on their action; however the bulk of the reductions are in items for other administrative cuts. For example, the bill effected reductions in the following, which will have little, if any, effect on administrative costs:

Contingency reserve for Bureau of Labor and Employment $4,000,000
Employees compensation fund 1,000,000
Vocational education grants 1,794,499
Payments to States for vocational rehabilitation 2,525,000
Grants to States for hospital construction 20,000,000
Grants in assistance 50,000,000
Grants to States for child welfare 3,000,000

Total 82,319,499

It will be noted, therefore, that this leaves something over $7,000,000 to be applied to administrative costs. How much of this will be applied to the reduction of personnel is questionable since a portion of it could be applied to the procurement of equipment, supplies, and contractual services of various kinds. Thus it can be readily seen that the reduction in personnel is relatively small, probably less than 1,000 employees from the budget request.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fabrication from the appendix of the budget document showing the average number of employees for fiscal years 1950-51 and estimated for 1952. This indicates a total number of employees of 46,800 in 1951, and 48,000 for 1952. It is true that some of the specific agencies show less employees; nevertheless in the aggregate there appears to be about 2,000 more employees requested in 1952 than was provided in 1950. The largest increase seems to be in the Trust Fund of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance which accounts for about 3,000 of the increase.

It might be argued that with respect to this particular bureau that they are not paid for out of appropriated funds, Nevertheless I think it should be an incentive for letting them get out of line. The more we protect the trust fund the less necessary it will be to increase the insurance rate to our citizens in the years to come.

Turn-over in the Government is a serious matter and this amendment, while seeking economy as its primary objective, does not consider an incentive for the agencies of government to try to hold the resignations down which in itself provides some economy in the retention of trained employees and the savings of payments for accrued annual leave. Under this amendment if the agencies can improve working conditions and keep employees longer, they are not penalized.

In the hearings before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee the Civil Service Commission testified that they expect a 3 percent per month turnover rate in the Federal government. Page 406, part 1—in fiscal year 1952. It is currently running at a rate of about 2.5 percent and the increase is expected to follow the pattern of the last war when it reached a peak of 5.5 percent in 1943.

This amendment is tailored to fit those particular agencies and will not work any hardship. It is noted also that transfers within the agencies are permitted under my amendment.

On the medical side we are also exempting medical personnel. It is our intention to exempt those medical services directly contributing to the comfort and welfare of the patient. This does not exempt administrative, statistical, and general maintenance personnel. We have like likewise exempted custodial employees in the lower grades recognizing that the turn-over rate is quite high in this category.

It is estimated that this amendment will deny the employment of about 8,000 persons in the fiscal year 1952 from the approximately 48,000 requested. Since they will be going off the rolls on a gradual basis we will assume that the 8,000 is the equivalent of 4,000 on a full-year basis. This would figure roughly about $16,000,000 from the budget requests less any other cuts amounts to in terms of personnel. I estimate that this amendment will further reduce the bill now before the House by ten to eleven million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this is the painless way, and the effective way, to reduce needless Federal employees.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, move to strike out the words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time for the sole purpose of asking the author of the amendment a question. I should like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment applies to veterans within the departments.

Mr. JENSEN. No. No one who is employed today is affected by this amendment whatsoever.

Mr. YATES. What about applicants for jobs who are veterans?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, of course, it applies to them. However, they have priority under the law.

Mr. YATES. But they could not get a job in the face of your amendment even though they have priority under the law.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the veterans of America are more concerned about saving America than anyone else that I know of. Certainly the gentleman knows that we have today over 2,200,000 people on the Federal payroll which is at least 750,000 more than we should have. The civilian payroll today consists of around 9,000,000,000. If the gentleman wants to support that kind of needless employment, why he can just go ahead.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the answer to my question about disbarring applicants who are veterans is "Yes."

Mr. JENSEN. Of course it will.

Mr. YATES. That is all.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this amendment clear to the House. It prohibits the filling of vacancies except to the extent of 25 percent of all those that occur. It makes an exception of hospitals, both in the regular Public Health Service and the one out at Bethesda, and several other units where it is absolutely necessary to fill vacancies.

Veterans who are employed would not be affected. Veterans would be able to have priority on appointments to the 25 percent of vacancies that would be filled.

We all know that the only way really to reduce Federal personnel is to stop the filling of vacancies, and that is what this amendment will do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I should like to observe in respect to the question asked of the gentleman from Iowa by the gentleman from Illinois just a moment ago that it apparently would contemplate that we were to keep all the number of jobs available just so that a veteran might have an opportunity to apply for one of them. My guess about that would be that the veteran would resent that sort of an argument just as much as anyone else here.

Mr. TABER. He would. On top of that, there is a turn-over in the different departments of close to 20 percent in a year. There is going to be plenty of opportunity for the veterans with their preferences to get jobs as things go along.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that we passed approximately this same amendment in the House last year in the omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. No, that applied to 10 percent of vacancies and this one applies to 25 percent of vacancies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This is far more liberal than the one the House accepted last year?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it has other provisions in it. It is a very much broader amendment and more liberal to the departments. I think it is absolutely necessary if we are ever going to save any money to adopt an amendment of this character.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time for the question of the gentleman who asked me about the veterans that if anybody is going to oppose this amendment on the ground that veterans do not have preference, he certainly does not have to ask about the veterans being afraid not to get along in America so long as we have an America.
Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What if it becomes necessary as a result of events to take a number of people out of Government jobs and put them in the armed forces? Would not this amendment play havoc with respect to the replacement of jobs and put them in the armed forces?

Mr. TABER. No, it would not.

Mr. JENSEN. It would be exactly the opposite.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. The amendment the gentleman offers today is not quite as bad as that one. He exempted the same personnel. Instead of limiting it to 10 percent of vacancies that have been filled in the next year, he raises it to 25 percent. But that is the liberal part of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. If my amendment had been made law last year we would have saved half a billion dollars, possibly, but instead of that Congress abdicated and we said to the Bureau of the Budget, "Now, you save $500,000,000." Mr. FOGARTY. But it was impossible, may I say to my friend, it was impossible to operate. They just could not find any head nor tail on the whole thing. You could not find out where it began and where it ended. You could not tell at the time it was offered how many people would be involved or how many jobs it would exempt or what classifications were going to be exempt. I remember very well the afternoon it was offered. In the House knew about it. You took up their issues. There was not a man in the House who could tell us exactly how far the amendment went.

Mr. JENSEN. And it passed the House and should have been the law of the land, and should be the law today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not with my vote. I do not know where the figures came from which the gentleman from Iowa gave as to the number of positions that are increased in this over-all appropriation bill, but as I recall hearing the figures he gave you, they were way out of line. The figures I have are as given to me by the Clerk who we believe to be infallible, and who is one of the best clerks in the House, and one of the most able and efficient men I have ever been handed these figures. The bill as we have reported it to you, in the Labor Department alone, provides for a cut of about 670 positions below what they had in 1951, assuming the administrative appropriations are all applied to salary items, as most of it would be. That is not below the budget estimate, but below what they had in 1951. The Clerk informed me that figure comes from a quick calculation made by the Department at his request. As far as the Federal Security Agency is concerned, on the same basis, we have taken about 280 positions below what they had last year—not below the budget estimate, but below what they had last year. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about appropriations. We are talking about decreases and cuts that we have made below the 1951 figures, and if you show me another committee that comes in with a bill like this one and which will show a decrease as we have made I want to be around to see it. In all honesty and in all fairness to the gentleman from Iowa, I want to say that we have been sincere in our efforts this year to bring in a good bill. We have gone much further in cuts than I would like to have gone, to be honest with you. Deeper cuts have been made in places in this bill than I have voted for since I have been a member of this committee. I believe it was the insistence of men like George Schwabe and Fred Bushey and others, and some on the Democratic side, including Senator Mortgage and others, and some on the Democratic side, including Senator Mortgage and others, and some on the Democratic side, including Senator Mortgage and others, that made that bill. I only had my way there.

Mr. JENSEN. Is killing over 200,000 people a year right here in our country. I would like to have offered an amendment to increase them by $5,000,000 for an educational program. If you men could have seen some of the people I have seen, some of them close to me, who have died from cancer, you would have gone along with me. If you had gone along with me a year ago on that raise, that would have been the greatest answer to socialized medicine that could be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FELCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment that was just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriations or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to positions filled from within the agency.

"(b) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(c) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmens Hospital.

"(d) to employees in grades CPO 1 and 2."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will make the vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker announced the following pairs:

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote: Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Greenwood against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Stagg against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Sawtelle against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Mutz against.

Mr. Chipperfield for, with Mr. Slemmings against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Héller against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Coutert for, with Mr. Klucznisky against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Leach against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Yorty against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. McKinnon against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Yorty against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Wickerman against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Baines with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Pardy with Mr. Vail.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Evans with Mr. Cotton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Speaker. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The Speaker. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Authorizing Clerk to make corrections in section numbers

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the engrossment of the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction in section numbers.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

General Leave to Extend

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Committee on Appropriations—Department of the Interior Appropriations

Mr. Kirwan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 20, to file a report on the Department of the Interior appropriation for 1953.

Mr. Jensen. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Adjourment over from Thursday to Monday

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the
MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2684

Mr. KEBERTHART. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Ways and Means Committee reported the bill (H. R. 2684) relating to powers of appointment covering the estate and gift tax provisions. I ask unanimous consent that those wishing to do so may have until tomorrow to file minority views on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Doar] I ask unanimous consent that the special order we have for today may be postponed until Wednesday next following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GENERAL POLITICS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I publicly raised the question of President Truman's arbitrary right to strip General MacArthur of the powers that were vested in him by international agencies of which the United States is but one participant.

In the week that has elapsed, Truman has failed to provide a clean and clear bill of particulars in support of his action.

If the charge is one of military insubordination then the preliminary steps toward a court martial should have been taken within a matter of hours after MacArthur was relieved of his command. If the general was removed because of differences in diplomatic policy then Truman should make plain when and where such authority was delegated to him by the United Nations Security Council and the Far Eastern Commission.

As a result of the events that have gone on within the past week, the American people are entitled to know now and not another year or two whether this is another Truman usurpation of power.

Mr. Speaker, it was with amazement and deep regret that I read the text of a speech made yesterday in Chicago by Gen. Omar Bradley to the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

In that speech, General Bradley went far beyond the limits of the military and into the field of so-called American foreign policy. It is understood that the Bradley speech was cleared by the State Department and Dean Acheson, whose lack has not yet been turned on Alger Hiss.

Presumably, the military can discuss and support so-called foreign policy on the platform of the brand endorsed by Acheson and Truman.

Here we have the spectacle of one five-star general, Bradley, being permitted, even aided and abetted by the State Department, to voice foreign policy, whereas, as another five-star general, MacArthur, is castigated and crucified for allegedly entering the same field.

Still another five-star general, Eisenhower, was turned loose under the Administration label to represent the Truman-Acheson European policies.

Therefore, I reiterate, it appears that it is perfectly all right for the generals to indulge in policies and politics unilaterally—as long as they stay on the Truman-Acheson side of the fence.

In other words, the high brass can now speak on any and every subject, the only requirement being that they clear it with Dean.

I might add that it seems to me, General Bradley, as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ought to have enough work these days to keep him completely occupied at the Pentagon.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Members of this House will have the opportunity of hearing an important address from one of our greatest generals, Douglas MacArthur, a man who has done a magnificent job as the occupation commander in Japan. Regardless of our thoughts about the general on other matters, we, I think, should pay him this honor and should consider the words which he will bring to us tomorrow.

In looking through the annual reports which Gen. Douglas MacArthur furnished each year when he was Chief of Staff, I came across a very wise section of that report which I believe the people of the Nation should have the benefit of. I am therefore at this time going to read a short paragraph from the annual report of Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur for the fiscal year 1932, page 97:

"The national strategy of any war—that is the action of nationizes in furtherance of the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the state, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be achieved has involved a short paragraph from the annual report of Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur for the fiscal year 1932, page 97:

"The national strategy of any war—that is the action of nationizes in furtherance of the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the state, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be achieved has involved a"
The basic issue in the controversy surrounding the removal of General MacArthur is the supremacy of civilian over military rule in the United States. The principle of civilian supremacy goes to the very heart of our democratic Government. The United States was built upon that principle and it must be forever safeguarded.

Therefore it must be strongly emphasized and clearly understood that the President had no other recourse but to remove General MacArthur when he persisted in public statements of policy that went far beyond his military authority and that were in conflict with the policy of the Government of the United States and of the United Nations. It makes no difference whether we think MacArthur is a great man or a stuffed shirt; it makes no difference whether we are Republicans or Democrats. Whether we like Harry Truman or not. The single, stark, and compelling consideration is that when a military man sets himself above his civilian Commander in Chief and repeatedly engages in acts of insubordination, he must be removed from his military office.

As far as I am concerned, no man, and certainly no military man, is more entitled, for the rest of his life, to have his principles and his record and his conduct of our foreign policy. In the final analysis, he must be accountable to the American people at the ballot box.

General MacArthur does not have to account to the American people at the ballot box in the democratic way. General MacArthur, being a five-star general, will draw a life-time salary of $18,761 per year. In addition to that he can take a civilian job or run for public office or take life easy. Besides full pay, he will be entitled, for the rest of his life, to have two or three officers or enlisted men as personal aids. Careful observers are convinced that General MacArthur knew full well what he was doing when he repeatedly defied the President of the United States. The conclusion is that General MacArthur forced the issue on the President, that he wanted to be either a savior or a martyr and if he could not be one, he wanted to be the other. These observers have pointed out that General MacArthur had good reason to know the consequences of insubordination. As Walter Lippmann, the noted columnist said: "It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors. (Washington Post, April 12, 1951.)"

And, mind you, this challenge by General MacArthur to his own Government, as Walter Lippmann said:

He challenged the President publicly, defiantly and on issues of such moment that they concerned deeply not only this Government, but all governments.

MacArthur knew about the consequences of insubordination. As an Army general he sat on a military court through the long weeks of trial of another famous general—Billy Mitchell—who was court-martialed, not so much for defying the President of the United States, as for challenging his superior officers' limited views on air power.

Gen. Billy Mitchell in his own words polemically wrote 10 years after the trial:

"MacArthur, whom I admired for his courage, his audacity and sincerity, surely could not be part of this. But there he was, his features as cold as carved stone."

Recalling that he had fought under MacArthur's father in the Philippine Insurrection and discussed with him in those early days the danger of a southward drive of Japanese imperialism, Billy Mitchell lamented:

"And here was his son, a brave soldier, appointed to strip me in midcareer, in an argument over a machine which might some day save the nation and the world."

Gen. Billy Mitchell wondered whether General MacArthur would even learn the lessons of air power which he failed to learn in Billy Mitchell's trial. Others have wondered, too, noting that MacArthur was embarrassed by the destruction of American airplanes in the Philippines on Pearl Harbor Day as they sat naked and exposed on Clark Field—and this despite the fact that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred 10 hours earlier.

MacArthur never thought that the Japanese would attack Manila in 1941. But back in 1925, when Billy Mitchell cried out against the danger of Japanese imperialism, General MacArthur wrote:

"The Philippine Insurrection was built by the give and take of public debate on these momentous issues of war and peace, and possibly at the ballot box."

I do want to express this thought: It is indeed regrettable and highly unfortunate that General MacArthur has allowed himself to become immersed in partisan politics. As General Eisenhowe r has pointed out, "it is much better for the President and the other citizen who has knowledge and information which may be of benefit to his country. Whether those views ultimately will prevail, in whole or in part, it is certain the President will not have the experience, by the give and take of public debate on these momentous issues of war and peace, and possibly at the ballot box."

I am glad that General MacArthur decided to return to the United States. He has not set foot on these continental shores for over 14 years. He has a boy 13 years old who never saw this country until a few days ago.

General MacArthur is entitled to—indeed, he has a duty—to express his views before the Congress. Any other citizen who has knowledge and information which may be of benefit to his country. Whether those views ultimately will prevail, in whole or in part, it is certain the President will not have the experience, by the give and take of public debate on these momentous issues of war and peace, and possibly at the ballot box.

I do want to express this thought: It is indeed regrettable and highly unfortunate that General MacArthur has allowed himself to become immersed in partisan politics. As General Eisenhowe r has pointed out, "it is much better for the President and the other citizen who has knowledge and information which may be of benefit to his country. Whether those views ultimately will prevail, in whole or in part, it is certain the President will not have the experience, by the give and take of public debate on these momentous issues of war and peace, and possibly at the ballot box."
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I am glad that General MacArthur decided to return to the United States. He has not set foot on these continental shores for over 14 years. He has a boy 13 years old who never saw this country until a few days ago.
clever and unscrupulous political manipulators. Personally, I doubt whether these political leaders have a hope for MacArthur himself, but they are willing to use him for a political bridgehead into 1932. It remains to be seen whether MacArthur will be any more obedient to the politicians who now ride on his military coattails than he was to his superior officers.

In the few days following the removal of General MacArthur, Members of Congress were deluged with telegrams and letters, many of them sincere and well-meant, others inspired in bulk by anti-administration newspapers and commentators. Frequently among these communications there appeared the demand that President Truman be impeached. It is deeply disturbing to see these indications of attitudes taken on a purely emotional, and without thinking through their meaning.

The stability and safety of America rests on the common sense of its people and the cool, considered judgment of its leaders. Indiscriminate demands for the impeachment of the President contribute no more to national unity and sound policy than indiscriminate demands that we rush blindly and headlong into a war against Communist China.

Under the Constitution of the United States, the President or any other officer of the Government can be impeached for committing certain high crimes or misdemeanors. The cool heads will prevail over this curious and strident clamor for impeaching the President when the President was only carrying out his plain duty under the laws and Constitution of the United States.

There are some people who see political benefit in hysteria. There are some people, as the President pointed out the other day, who calculate that confusion would work for them. If there is one thing our political experience teaches us, it is that men who seek political advantage by nourishing fear, panic, and hysteria are those who are allowed to guide the Nation's destiny, then this country will rush toward chaos amidst the ranting of demagogues.

Note that the best-informed and most-responsible elements of the American press have endorsed the President's removal of General MacArthur. Newspapers like the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and other great dailies, have taken that position in their editorial pages.

If you are concerned about your country's future and you wish to contribute to the solution of the problems which threaten its very existence, the only way you have to think through the basic issues. Base your judgments, not on irritations, resentments, and anxiety, but on calm, cold reasoning about events. To be angry is nothing. No, are there easy answers to the problems that beset this Nation?

Before you decide where you stand on the MacArthur issue, try to think through the implications of his stated position. Do you want more war in Asia or less war? Our Government is leading the fight in Korea today as a localized war, or as a massive aggression. General MacArthur is potentially committed toward an all-out war, with Communist China and probably through that vast enmagement, into a world war III.

Contrast MacArthur's view with that of General Omar N. Bradley, another great soldier and a great American. General Bradley, chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said:

Any recommended course of action which would engage the present war is contrary to our best interests.

Ask yourselves, Are we ready to wage all-out war? My answer is, decidedly, "No." Our defense mobilization program in this country is just a few months old. We have made substantial progress, but we have not begun to approach the dimensions of the task before us. America is readying her defenses and keeping the pipelines filled to our fighting men in Korea. America is not ready to take on the whole Communist world.

Ask yourselves, Is War inevitable? My answer is "No; war is not that simple."

But General MacArthur apparently is proceeding on the assumption that it is, and he wants to rush it along.

From the men in the Kremlin who control the destiny of the Communist world, we cannot expect friendship and good will. We know better than to seek to placate them by appeasement. Between freedom and tyranny there will always be hostility. But it does not follow that hostility must become wholesale war. The aggressive ideology of communism can be curbed without a world war, if we make the necessary show of strength.

America cannot do it alone: We need friends and allies. To build our own defenses, to put guns into the hands of our friends, takes time. The essence of our Government's policy today is to limit warfare in places where aggression is manifest and to deploy our strategic forces carefully throughout the world at potential danger points, rather than to throw all of our resources indiscriminately into one vast undertaking that will consume these resources quickly and dissipate our national energies.

That would be the case if we carried the war to Communist China, as General MacArthur would have us do, rather than to fight it out in Korea, where we are holding our own today and taking a terrible toll of the enemy.

Ask yourselves, what will be Russia's position if we carry this war to the massiv continent of Asia, to the jungles and deserts of China? Russia is pledged by treaty to aid Red China in case we become embroiled in armed conflict with Russia. Today, with our commitments in Korea, we could not keep Japan from Russian hands and the loss of the Japanese productive machine to the Communists will mean that all Asia would be lost to us.
The problem is to prevent the industrial and military techniques of the Ruhr, Japan, and other industrial areas from falling into Soviet control.

The problem is to keep the oil of Iran from the tanks and planes of the Formosa island, and to keep these resources from being prematurely exploded by Communist China because that is the only hope he has in the world to reestablish his power.

To me the fighting today in Korea and the sacrificing of American blood is a fight for freedom and not a fight to serve the ambitions of a disgruntled generalissimo who has been bypassed by history.

As ourselves, what would happen to our allies and particularly the nations of Western Europe with whom we are dedicated jointly in the defense of freedom, if MacArthur's views were to be followed out? MacArthur's independent pronouncements made without the sanction of his Government constituted a slap in the face of the European nations with whom we are united in a joint-defense program under the direction of General Eisenhower.

In martial accents, MacArthur declared that European diplomats were talking about a war being fought in Asia. The important thing to remember is, that our Nation is dedicated to the fight for freedom in all parts of the world. America has given to the Nationalist Government. It is not acquainted with the intricate details of our relationships with Europe, who has never shown any particular knowledge of, or interest in, Europe as the cradle of western civilization, simply lacks the perspective and the balanced appraisal of American commitments in the fight for freedom.

MacArthur's insistence on charting his own independent course of foreign policy regardless of the Department of Defense, regardless of the State Department, regardless of the President of the United States, is alienating those nations of Europe who looked upon his program, rightly or wrongly, as a bypassing of European defense and wholesale investment of our resources and energies in a futile land war with China.

It makes no difference whether you feel friendly or unfriendly toward countries like Great Britain or other European countries, the fact remains that in these countries we will find the energy and will and the resources to help us to oppose Communist aggression throughout the world.

No, my friends, this is no time to lose ourselves in a sea of emotion, hysteria, or hate. This is the time to exercise calmness and collective judgment. The problem is a quick military victory in Korea. Korea is important because there, for the first time, the collective force of free nations is in action against unwarranted totalitarian aggression.

The problem is to organize and equip the free nations of the world against atheistic communism.
that he wrote gave strong, convincing reasons as to why President Truman should be indicted. He was one of the few newspapermen, in fact, one of the few persons in any field of human activity, who accurately analyzed and forecast the political results of 1948.

In addition to his many duties in the newspaper field, in radio discussions, in charitable work, and in other fields of constructive endeavor, the late Henry J. Gillen still had time to take a prominent part in community and civic affairs. He was always the leader in every movement that represented progress.

The late Henry J. Gillen was a good man—a man of understanding mind who loved God and loved his fellowmen and who lived up to the spiritual truths that he believed in. His passing at a comparatively early age leaves a vacancy that will be hard to fill. The newspaper profession throughout the country has lost one of its great constructive members. The Commonwealth has lost one of its great citizens. Boston has lost one of its greatest friends. I have lost one whom I admired greatly and whose friendship I valued very much.

It is very seldom that remarks are made on the floor of the House about the death of anyone who is not a Member of the House or who did not formerly serve in the House of Representatives, but the life of the late Henry J. Gillen was such during his span on earth that I take the floor of the House today to call the attention of my colleagues to the death of this truly great man.

COMMENT ON RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include the text of a speech made in Chicago on April 17 by Gen. George C. Marshall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there are no simple and easy ways of finding and maintaining peace in the world. The American people are rightly concerned about the duration of the conflict in Korea and about our mounting American casualties. However, they will find no answer in the resolutions proposed yesterday in the other body.

On the one hand, a Member of the other body from my State of Washington proposes that we throw away the gains we have made in Korea, ignore the sacrifices we have made, and pull out of that victorious conflict. On the other hand, he proposes the alternative that we carry the war to the mainland of China, thereby exposing us to a vast, unlimited undertaking in the desert and jungles of this massive region and to the imminent prospect of a third world war. The Chinese mainland as a battlefield will make Korea look like a Disneyland.

Soviet Russia and Red China are committed to a mutual-assistance pact, and there is good reason to suppose that if we attack the Chinese mainland Siberia-based Russian planes will launch a devastating blow on Japan. If Japan goes to the Communists all Asia goes with her.

This country, as a member of the United Nations, is committed to opposing aggression wherever and whenever it shows up. The war in Korea today is a limited war against aggression. We are taking the battle to the aggressors while restricting the battlefield to a small and relatively maneuverable area.

The two opposing resolutions introduced in the other body show an understandable impatience with the present Korean situation, but they are dangerously deceptive if they pretend to offer a solution to our problem. The author belongs to the all-or-nothing school which insists on seeing black or white in a world which is gray with uncertainty and danger.

Personally, I prefer to base my judgment on the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, a great soldier and a great American. General Bradley has made it clear that "any course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests."

That disposes of any proposal to declare war on Communist China. The other resolution proposed in the other body from my State of Massachusetts is a rank kind of isolationism which hardly deserves consideration in the light of our commitments as a responsible member of the United Nations.

The two resolutions foster confusion in a world which so badly needs understanding. Widespread study of General Bradley’s Chicago speech would foster understanding and, by unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the Record:

It is hard to realize that our relatively small-scale military operations in Korea hold the key to the success or failure or our world-wise strategy.

In the hands of our United Nations soldiers, sailors, and airmen, fighting the war in Korea, the Communists have been forced to make a strategic retreat.

Our armed forces threw twice as many North Korean and Communist aggressors as they had the previous year.

Failure in Korea will only invite another aggression.

When our forces were in the throes of withdrawal last December, many people, who saw no point to further struggle, were recommending that we give up the fight. Nothing could have been more disastrous for the South Koreans, the United States, the United Nations, and the ultimate chances for peace in this world.

As much as I hate war, if we had abandoned Korea under any circumstances back than being driven out, we would have dealt a tragic blow to the hopes of freemen everywhere for peace.

THREE BASIC OBJECTIVES

In Korea our foreign policy and our military policy are united in three basic objectives:

First, to protect and maintain our form of government and our way of life against any challenge. On this point we recognize no limitation of expenditures or of exertion.

Second, to seek peace by every means at our command. We will not provoke a war against anyone. And we will not wage a so-called preventive war even against an arch-enemy, for this certainly destroys peace. But there is one price we will not pay—appeasement.

Third, to assure peace, not only for ourselves, but for all others. For this reason we support the United Nations, knowing that world peace is an integral part of American security.

I would like to emphasize that our military action in Korea is closely related to our North Atlantic Treaty efforts in Europe. The same guiding principles govern our actions there. We join in the North Atlantic Treaty as a collective defense effort for mutual security. In collective action, we multiply our defensive strength. Broadly stated, the individual nations gain strength from their close ties, and individually, are more secure.

HOPE TO CURE AGGRESSION

Not only are we trying to contain communism but we hope to deter all forms of aggression in order to bring peace to the world. Through our efforts in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty, and our even more positive action in Korea, we have drawn the line up an unmistakable fact: the appeasement of communism is not part of American policy.

If Korea communism went without warning one step further than it had ever gone before, and for the first time resorted to open and organized armed aggression to gain its objectives ends, shedding even its pretense of peaceful intention.

The United Nations had to take some quick, positive action. The decision to support the Republic of Korea, first with air and sea power, and then, for the first time resorted to open and organized armed aggression to gain its objectives ends, shedding even its pretense of peaceful intention.

It is no surprise that the United Nations had to act quickly and strongly to maintain a free world. The United Nations had to declare war on aggression wherever and whenever it shows up. The author of the other body from my State of Massachusetts proposes that we throw away the gains we have made in Korea, ignore the sacrifices we have made, pull out of that victorious conflict, and give the Communists an invitation to throw open the floodgates of aggression wherever and whenever it shows up.

As we proceed with the assigned military task in Korea, our military advisers and planners are keeping these three important factors in mind:

1. If we are sincere in our intent, then we will be in a position to make peace sooner rather than later.

2. If we are sincere in our intent, then we will be in a position to prevent a damage to the world order which might be catastrophic.

3. If we are sincere in our intent, then we will be in a position to prevent a damage to the world order which might be catastrophic.
tion to date. Neither has it been any serious threat to our democracy.

And third, every decision we have recommended has supported United Nations unity in the war against communism. With these principles in mind, we of the United Nations are now doing an outstanding military job.

Collective security is always risky and often unwarranted, but I would like to give my personal opinion as to some of the accomplishments of the Korean decision. We prolonged and emphasized public attention. I doubt that even those who supported this move at the time realized how much more was being gained toward world peace.

KEOREAN PLANS DISRUPTED

I believe that our positive action in support of the United Nations resolution was unexpected by the Kremlin-dominated Communists. I think we scored an advantage, and disarranged their plans for Asia.

I think our positive action in support of the United Nations slowed down the plans for world domination, not only in Asia, but in other areas in the world.

The Communist action in Korea indicated to me that the people in the Kremlin were willing to risk world war III. I believe the United Nations resolution in Korea gave them pause for thought.

I would also estimate that our action in Korea is needed, at least temporarily, Chinese Communist aggression toward Indo-China. It may have saved Thailand. It may have delayed Formosa. At least it gained time in all of these areas.

There was no doubt in the minds of free men that we had to draw a line somewhere. Appeasement had forfeited our chance to stop communism, and encourage them to continue picking off helpless nations. The rest of the international situation would have become intolerable as the Red-dominated areas covered more of the map.

Today, we are carrying out the military operations to enforce this political decision. As we carry out these actions, even though it would possibly result for a time in a military stalemate, we have already achieved an international victory.

THE SERVICE TOWARD THE GOAL

As long as we are able to confine the battles to Korea and continue to destroy the Communist aggressors, we are making progress toward our objective of venting world war III. As long as we are keeping Communist forces occupied and off balance, we will have the war confined to Korea.

We are minimizing their chances for world domination.

We are not going to be faced with some difficult decisions in Korea in the next few months. To solve them we must realize that Korea is not a brief, acute attack of a new disease. It is a symptom of a chronic ailment which must be cured.

In outlining my thoughts on this matter, I have no intention of entering the foreign policy field or even urging a particular policy in the conduct of foreign affairs. Conduct of foreign policy must be based upon our military capabilities to back it up.

We cannot take the chance of trying to answer every question from a Communist International. We can only determine their capabilities, and prepare to meet them. Otherwise we would be in a guessing game without the advantage of playing Russian roulette with a gun at our heads.

PREPARED TO MEET DRIVE

Fundamentally we Americans are apt to become fixated on a situation with no foreseeable conclusion. We all would like to know when the war in Korea will be over.

I wish that I might tell you: My job would be less difficult.

If we examine the Communist capabilities in Korea, we find indications that in the short run, Chinese Communist forces are attempting to engineer a 'run' for another drive. We must prepare to meet it. There is no assurance that even this attack is dispelled that the war will be over.

In the event of Korea, so remote rise of an early solution are apt to become frustrated and discouraged. There have been recurring similar situations to that which have been put off until delivering an ultimatum to those who encourage such local wars and who obstruct sincere efforts for peaceful negotiation.

Any such direct, unilateral solution to the problem would be militarily infeasible.

I wonder if these responsible citizens have pondered the conditions of such an act? Any ultimatum must state clearly the irresistible minimum of what we would regard as satisfactory and it ordinarilly, if not always, implies a threat to use force if the demands are not met. These disinterested and impatient strategists—and they are not representing the views of responsible Air Force officials—suggest the threat of bombardment as part of the ultimatum.

BEST CHANCE FOR SURVIVAL

Our policy is to avoid war and to promote peace. Our best chance for the survival of our way of life is to continue cooperation in mutual security efforts and to continue negotiation in this worldwide conflict as long as possible. An ultimatum would either commit us to a so-called preventive war, or gain for us only a temporary respite. Our enemy feels that conditions for his victory were more favorable.

Enlarging the battle to a full-scale war is never an economical or morally acceptable solution to a limited conflict. If at all possible, Korea should be settled on the present battleground.

The confinement or extension of the area of combat is in the realm of diplomacy and international politics. However, the military consideration is an intrinsic part of this problem. Our Armed Forces will continue to carry out the tasks assigned to them until conditions permit a political decision to be reached.

I have mentioned the complexity of the United Nations problems only to encourage us in a steadfast course of patience and preparedness.

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES PRAISED

The United Nations forces in Korea have done a magnificent job in the conduct of the war. But the American soldier, whether in combat or in the rear, has exhibited a cooperative spirit that is more effective than any one could have previously imagined.

The Air Force and the Navy have performed wonders in supporting the ground forces in Korea. They have exercised Ingenuity and imagination in carrying out missions that could not have been anticipated.

The Marines have performed heroically side by side with our soldiers.

I am especially proud of the United States Army. The soldiers entered the war in platoon strength, building up to a force of six divisions, which have fought through fierce summer heat and bitter winter, usually against great odds, and with planes and companies, battalions and regiments which were for a long time under strength.

The American people can be very proud of their Armed Forces and of the spirit which these men have shown. If we here at home can only set the standards of sacrifice and devotion—to their achievements in patience and courage—there is a good reason to believe that the war in Korea can ultimately be concluded on honorable terms, contributing to a hoped-for permanent peace in our times.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRKWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. VAN PEIT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. BENDER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include editorials.

Mr. SHAFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a brief statement.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects and include editorials in each.

Mr. MCCORMACK was given permission to extend his remarks and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $228.50.

Mr. WEICHSEL (at the request of Mr. Scorza) was given permission to extend his remarks and to include additional printed matter.

Mr. CARNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.
Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MOLDRER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by David Lawrence.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Springfield Republican.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. HAVENER) was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee on the Whole and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a prominent farmer in his district.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BUSSEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Folly."

Mr. BUSSEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of Illinois.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include letters and one telegram.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNANAH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Cartwright (at the request of Mr. DURELL), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for the balance of today after 5:45 p.m., on account of an important medical appointment.

To Mr. Corron (at the request of Mr. DOUG), from April 19 to April 24, inclusive, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. Ansarr (at the request of Mr. FOGUE), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 60. An act for the relief of Clara Elizabeth Ingrova;

S. 82. An act to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while those forces were in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 20, 1941; and

S. 379. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 17, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

ADJOINTMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m. the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

330. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Charles William Kleinert, filed No. CR 25642, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the Department of Justice, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

391. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 26, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

392. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Armando Galatol, file No. CR 29663, and Vincenzo Maglione, file No. CR 29663 (CR 29668), requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

393. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish a department of food service for the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

394. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting Audit Reports of Corporations of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Radiore Drexsee; with amendments (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of Zbigole Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Zospera Dunikowski; with amendments (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton; without amendments (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Olivo Falvo Citrino; without amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Henry Kolish; with amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn; with amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Boborski; with amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary, H. P. 8141. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Reichardt; with amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSER:

H. R. 3755. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEYRON:

H. R. 3785. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 2 of the United States Code, entitled "The Congress"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3787. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 20 of the United States Code, entitled "Education"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3786. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3789. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Criminal Laws"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BURDICK:
H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to prevent transfers of materials with our enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:
H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should commit itself to certain foreign policies designed to combat the spread of communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS
Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against Chinese Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating funds for flood control at Hanapepe, Kauai, authorized by the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, section 10; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 3770. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Añóni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:
H. R. 3771. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:
H. R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Cecíl Lennox Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVANIT:
H. R. 3773. A bill for the relief of Eric Adolf Lenz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEG:
H. R. 3774. A bill for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 3775. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando Artuso and Family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 3776. A bill for the relief of Equitable Infants Wear, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS:
H. R. 3777. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Hnatow and Maria Hnatow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICE:
H. R. 3778. A bill for the relief of Wm. See Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:
H. R. 3779. A bill for the racially ineligible fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:
H. R. 3780. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Merl Kerch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.
Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

231. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the City Council of the City of Burbank, Calif., petitioning the Congress and the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to proceed with its proposed investigation of redistricting in the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

232. By Mr. VAN PELETT: Petition of Nicholas Meyer, of Madison, Wis., and farmers of Sixth Congressional District protesting changes in the farm parity provisions in the Defense Production Act of 1950 and price ceilings and roll-backs on farm products selling below parity levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. By Mr. SHEEHAN: Memorial of the State of Illinois, Sixty-seventh General Assembly Senate, senate resolution No. 49: "Resolved, by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we express our unqualified confidence in General MacArthur and vigorously condemn the irresponsible and capricious action of the President in summarily discharging him from his command and that we further condemn such action as obstructing an opportunity to General MacArthur and others of his command to inform the people of our country of the true nature of affairs in Korea and the Far East; and be it further..."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

234. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry C. Ballam, secretary, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., extending its greetings to General Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Armed Services.

235. Also, petition of Pedro Gregorio, secretary, Municipality of Piaridel, Province of Bulacan, Republic of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of gratitude to the generosity of the American people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

236. Also, petition of R. E. Tolentino, secretary, Municipality of Bula, Province of Bulacan, Republic of the Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of legislation for additional war damage appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.